



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**THE PROPENSITY FOR MENTORSHIP AT THE UNITED
STATES NAVAL ACADEMY: A STUDY OF NAVY AND
MARINE CORPS JUNIOR OFFICERS**

by

Benjamin W. Oakes

June 2005

Co-Advisors:

W. Brad Johnson
Susan P. Hocevar

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE June 2005	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: The Propensity for Mentorship at the United States Naval Academy: A Study of Navy and Marine Corps Junior Officers			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Benjamin W. Oakes				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) This study examines junior officers at the United States Naval Academy, and their commitment to mentor midshipmen. Survey data are reported from 148 Navy Lieutenants and Lieutenant Commanders and Marine Corps Captains and Majors, stationed on the Naval Academy yard. The purpose of this study was to better understand the mentoring experiences, dispositions, and motivations among junior officers at the Naval Academy and identify how previous mentorship experience, prosocial behaviors, and personal (versus instrumental) motives relate to junior officer willingness to mentor Naval Academy midshipmen. The study concludes that helping others and benefiting the organization appear to be the distinguishing sources of motivation for junior officers who choose to mentor. Additionally, it finds that a junior officer's willingness to mentor and their levels of other-oriented empathy are associated with whether or not they chose to mentor. Lastly, this study reports that junior officers who were familiar with mentorship, and had previously been mentored in the fleet chose to mentor midshipmen at a much higher rate than their peers who were never protégés to a mentor.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Mentoring, junior officer mentors, mentoring and midshipmen, mentoring at the U.S. Naval Academy, previous mentorship experience, military mentorship			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 103	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**THE PROPENSITY FOR MENTORSHIP AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL
ACADEMY: A STUDY OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS JUNIOR OFFICERS**

Benjamin W. Oakes
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1999

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE IN LEADERSHIP AND HUMAN RESOURCE
DEVELOPMENT**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2005**

Author: Benjamin W. Oakes

Approved by: W. Brad Johnson, Ph.D.
Thesis Co-Advisor

Susan P. Hocevar, Ph.D.
Thesis Co-Advisor

Dr. Douglas A. Brook
Dean, Graduate School of Business & Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

This study examines junior officers at the United States Naval Academy, and their commitment to mentor midshipmen. Survey data are reported from 148 Navy Lieutenants and Lieutenant Commanders and Marine Corps Captains and Majors, stationed on the Naval Academy yard. The purpose of this study was to better understand the mentoring experiences, dispositions, and motivations among junior officers at the Naval Academy and identify how previous mentorship experience, prosocial behaviors, and personal (versus instrumental) motives relate to junior officer willingness to mentor Naval Academy midshipmen. The study concludes that helping others and benefiting the organization appear to be the distinguishing sources of motivation for junior officers who choose to mentor. Additionally, it finds that a junior officer's willingness to mentor and their levels of other-oriented empathy are associated with whether or not they chose to mentor. Lastly, this study reports that junior officers who were familiar with mentorship, and had previously been mentored in the fleet chose to mentor midshipmen at a much higher rate than their peers who were never protégés to a mentor.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	BACKGROUND	1
B.	PURPOSE.....	3
C.	METHODOLOGY	4
D.	SCOPE, LIMITATIONS, AND ASSUMPTIONS	4
E.	BENEFITS OF THE STUDY	5
F.	ORGANIZATION OF STUDY	6
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
A.	MENTORSHIP 101	7
1.	Mentor Functions (Career vs. Psychosocial)	7
2.	Phases of a Mentor Relationship	7
3.	Informal vs. Formal Mentor Relationships	8
4.	Gender and Racial Influences on Mentoring	10
5.	Mentoring Environments	11
6.	Misconceptions about Mentoring	13
B.	MENTORING OUTCOMES.....	14
1.	Protégé Benefits.....	14
2.	Mentor Benefits.....	15
3.	Organization Benefits	16
4.	Negative Outcomes.....	17
C.	MENTORS & PROTEGES	18
1.	The Mentor	18
2.	The Protégé.....	21
D.	MILITARY MENTORSHIP	22
1.	Mentoring in the Army	23
2.	Navy Flag Officers and Mentorship.....	24
E.	MENTORSHIP AT USNA.....	24
1.	Midshipmen Mentoring Experiences	25
2.	USNA Faculty Mentors of Midshipmen	26
3.	Existing Mentor Programs.....	27
F.	SUMMARY	28
III.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	31
A.	SAMPLE	31
B.	MEASURES	32
1.	Experience as a Mentor	33
2.	Experience as a Protégé.....	33
3.	Willingness to Mentor.....	33
4.	Prosocial Personality	34
5.	Mentor Motives	34
6.	Mentoring Functions	35
C.	PROCEDURE AND DATA ANALYSIS	36

IV.	DATA ANALYSIS.....	39
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	39
B.	PREVALENCE OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS.....	39
C.	DEMOGRAPHIC AND BIOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS	40
	1. Gender.....	40
	2. Race	40
	3. Branch of Military Service.....	41
	4. Time in Service and Tour at USNA.....	41
	5. Marital Status and Children.....	42
	6. Career Intentions	43
	7. Education	44
	8. Previous Mentor Experience.....	45
	9. USNA.....	46
D.	MENTOR MOTIVATION & DISPOSITION.....	48
	1. Willingness.....	50
	2. Prosocial Personality	50
	3. Mentor Motives	51
E.	MENTOR FUNCTIONS.....	52
	1. Mentor Functions as a Predictor of Mentoring	52
	2. Mentor Functions Practiced by Junior Officers at USNA.....	53
F.	SHORT ANSWER.....	54
G.	SUMMARY	55
V.	CONCLUSION	57
A.	DISCUSSION	57
B.	SUMMARY	61
C.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	62
D.	LIMITATIONS	63
E.	RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS	64
F.	CONCLUSION	66
APPENDIX A:	JUNIOR OFFICER MENTORSHIP SURVEY	67
APPENDIX B:	MENTORSHIP SURVEY SHORT ANSWER SUMMARIES	77
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	85
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Factor Loadings of Motives to Mentor Items	36
Table 2.	Junior Officer–Midshipmen Mentor Relationships	39
Table 3.	Gender and USNA Mentorship.....	40
Table 4.	Race and USNA Mentorship	41
Table 5.	Military Branch of Service and USNA Mentorship	41
Table 6.	Time and USNA Mentorship.....	42
Table 7.	Marital Status and USNA Mentorship.....	42
Table 8.	Children and USNA Mentorship	43
Table 9.	Career Intentions and USNA Mentorship.....	44
Table 10.	Education Level and USNA Mentorship	44
Table 11.	Alma Mater and USNA Mentorship	45
Table 12.	Protégé Experience and USNA Mentorship	45
Table 13.	Mentor Experience and USNA Mentorship.....	46
Table 14.	USNA Mentor Training and USNA Mentorship	47
Table 15.	Mentorship Barriers and USNA Mentorship	47
Table 16.	Rewarding Mentorship and USNA Mentorship	48
Table 17.	Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations Among Variables.....	49
Table 18.	Prosocial Personalities and USNA Mentorship	51
Table 19.	Mentor Motives and USNA Mentorship.....	52
Table 20.	Mentor Functions and USNA Mentorship.....	53
Table 21.	USNA Junior Officer Mentor Functions.....	54

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincerest gratitude to all those who contributed to this thesis. Its completion would not have been possible without the junior officers at the United States Naval Academy, the Naval Academy's Department of Institutional Research, and the Nimitz Library staff. I also extend my deepest appreciation to my advisors, Dr. Susan Hocevar and Dr. Brad Johnson, whose mentorship, sacrifice, professionalism, and friendship made this study not only possible, but an enjoyable learning experience as well. Finally, I would like to thank my lovely wife, Kimberly, whose support, patience, and understanding were paramount to the successful completion of this work in a timely manner; and Bear, who selflessly spent hours every day at my feet with a constant gaze that was willing me to put the thesis aside and take him outside to play fetch. Thank you both for keeping a smile on my face.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Mentors are important to the career development of subordinates within today's organizations. Though 'mentorship' has become a buzzword in business and leadership, it is not simply one of the organizational world's latest trends. The fact that the concept of mentorship originated in Greek mythology as a part of Homer's, *The Odyssey*, and has been with us ever since, is a testament to the enduring importance of mentors and the mentor-protégé relationship. In Homer's epic-tale, as Odysseus leaves to fight the Trojan War, he entrusts his son Telemachus to his good friend Mentor (Buhler, 1998). While Odysseus is away, Mentor develops into a teacher, guide, friend, and father figure to Telemachus. This proverbial Mentor role has stood the test of time and continues to be a focus of organizations looking to develop junior talent for future generations.

The concept of mentorship is plagued by a wide variety of definitions. Typically, mentoring denotes the relationship between an older, wiser, and more experienced person, the mentor, and a younger person, the protégé (Kram 1983). Digging deeper, we find that mentors are often characterized as individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing support to and increasing the career advancement of junior organizational members, their protégés (e.g., Allen, 2002; Kram, 1985). Similarly, a mentor can be seen as someone who takes a personal interest in, guides, sponsors, or otherwise has a positive and significant influence on the professional career development of a junior person or protégé (Allen 2003).

The concept of mentoring has proven to be difficult to grasp. However, there are a few consistent features of these developmental relationships. First and foremost, we know that mentoring can be classified as either formal, wherein designated mentors are assigned protégés, or informal, in which the mentor-protégé relationship is unscheduled and develops naturally (Chao & Walz, 1992). Prior research has shown that individuals who take on a mentor role typically provide two categories of mentor functions or behaviors (e.g., Allen, 2002; Kram, 1985). Functions are normally classified as career

functions (i.e., sponsorship for professional opportunities) or psychosocial functions (i.e., enhance protégé's self-esteem and confidence). Finally, both the mentor and the protégé bring to the relationship a set of personal behaviors and characteristics, as well as professional values, motivations, and functions. Understanding a mentor relationship requires some understanding of the interactions among these factors.

Previous research describes how pro-social personality characteristics influence decisions to mentor. Pro-social behaviors are generally considered those behaviors demonstrated by organizational members that are designed to benefit the people, groups, or organizations around them. Allen (2002) classified other-oriented empathy and helpfulness as two areas of pro-social behavior that effect mentorship.

Regarding the outcomes of mentoring, research indicates that protégé's who are mentored advance through their organization's ranks more quickly, earn larger salaries, are less likely to quit their jobs, and express more positive demeanors (e.g., Dreher & Ash, 1990; Fagenson, 1989; Scandura, 1992; Whitely, Dougherty & Dreher, 1991). Although there is strong evidence that mentoring produces positive outcomes for protégés and organizations, it is important to keep in mind that as an interpersonal relationship, mentoring is complex and multi-faceted (e.g., Allen, 2003; Kram, 1985), and that mentoring experiences exist on a spectrum from positive to negative.

At the United States Naval Academy (USNA), in Annapolis, Maryland, there are many opportunities for mentor-protégé relationships to develop during an officer's four years spent as a midshipman. The organizational climate and military culture at USNA lend themselves to the enhancement of its midshipmen through such relationships. There are many groups of potential mentors at USNA. Civilian faculty and administrators, as well as military junior and senior officer instructors or administrative staff have the opportunity to mentor midshipmen.

Often referred to as a 'leadership laboratory,' the United States Naval Academy's (USNA) organizational purpose is to provide the Navy and Marine Corps with officers capable of leading their subordinates and respective services into the future. Specifically, the Naval Academy's mission is:

To develop midshipmen morally, mentally, and physically, and to imbue them with the highest ideals of duty, honor, and loyalty in order to provide graduates who are dedicated to a career of Naval service and have potential for future development in mind and character to assume the highest responsibilities of command, citizenship, and government (USNA *Reef Points*, 2004).

Just how does the Naval Academy achieve its mission? What individuals, roles, and training components are integral to this transformation of midshipmen into officers? The rigors the midshipmen endure through their carefully structured academic and physical education programs in conjunction with leadership and character development are the foundation for this developmental process. The responsibility for ensuring these programs are effective and that USNA ultimately meets its mission rests at the feet of the Naval Academy faculty and administration. Instructors, civilian and military alike, and the Navy and Marine Corps officers stationed at the Naval Academy are integral to our military's future officers at USNA. The leadership, guidance, example, and mentorship these faculty members provide continues to influence the men and women graduating from the Naval Academy well beyond the four years they spend here as midshipmen.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which junior officers stationed at the Naval Academy mentor midshipmen. Specifically, the research focuses on two primary questions about mentorship: 1) What factors motivate junior officers to choose to mentor? and 2) What individual-level pro-social characteristics influence mentoring at the Naval Academy? This study tests the assumption that junior officers willingly serve as mentors to midshipmen. It also examines the extent to which junior officers themselves have been mentored and the effect those relationship experiences have on their willingness to mentor. This study explores the extent to which Naval Academy junior officers serve as mentors for midshipmen and some of the personnel characteristics influencing the choice to mentor.

C. METHODOLOGY

A literature review consisting of over 40 books, journal articles, professional publications, and previous studies focusing on mentorship, was conducted to gather an in-depth understanding of the concept of mentoring. The review identified those factors that contribute to the mentor-protégé relationship, and the pro-social behaviors that are often characteristic of mentors. Motivations, pro-social behaviors, and mentor functions have previously been shown to affect a superior's decision to be a mentor.

A survey instrument was derived from the questionnaire used in Allen's study (2002) and tailored to fit the military culture and the Naval Academy junior officers. The draft survey was reviewed and approved by members of the Naval Academy faculty and its Office of Institutional Research. The survey consisted of questions regarding junior officer experiences as both a mentor and a protégé before being stationed at the Naval Academy and their mentoring experiences during their tours at USNA. Questions were also asked in regard to their willingness and motivations for choosing to mentor midshipmen. Additionally, the survey included various question sets that covered the specific behaviors exhibited by junior officers in mentor relationships, as well as their overall pro-social behavioral tendencies. Lastly, the survey included 3 short answer questions designed to capture the junior officers' perspectives of mentorship at the Naval Academy. The survey also requested individual junior officer demographic information. The sampling frame for this study consisted of every junior officer in the ranks of O3 & O4 [Lieutenant (LT) & Lieutenant Commander (LCDR) in the Navy or Captain (CAPT) & Major (MAJ) in the Marine Corps] stationed at the Naval Academy (N=262). The resulting sample totaled 148 junior officer stationed at USNA.

To provide context, I also analyzed Naval Academy mission statements and institutional documents to learn what the institution's goals are in terms of developing the junior officer-midshipmen mentor relationship.

D. SCOPE, LIMITATIONS, AND ASSUMPTIONS

The scope of this research is a study of the junior officer as mentors to the Naval Academy brigade of midshipmen. An abundance of studies on mentorship exist,

however, most of these studies focus on the perspectives of the protégé. Moreover, little research has been conducted on mentorship within the military organization as a whole; nor the military academies specifically. These findings suggest a need for further research in these areas.

A few limitations to this study should be noted: (1) there is a great degree of variance in definitions of ‘mentorship’ and a higher prevalence of mentoring is normally found in studies where subject data is obtained through in-depth interviews versus query surveys (e.g., Merriam, 1983; Baker, 2001). Merriam (1983) and Baker (2001) suggest that people respond differently to interviews than they do to surveys, and their survey responses vary depending on how specifically the term ‘mentor’ is defined and their own idiosyncratic understandings of mentorship. This study used a baseline definition of mentorship to attempt to diminish this effect. (2) This study only focused on junior officers at USNA, not other potential mentors. (3) Limitations are inherent in self-reported assessments. (4) Junior officers detailed to the Naval Academy have short tours of duty, resulting in a limited timeframe for which to develop a mentor-protégé relationship. Typically, junior officer tours last 2-3 years in duration.

This study assumed that mentoring relationships were personal relationships between a senior and a junior military member, wherein the mentor took a personal interest in, guided, sponsored, and had a positive influence on the professional career development of the protégé (Allen 2002). It was also assumed that any mentor relationship was beneficial to the organization and the individuals involved (Jacobi, 1991; Kram 1985). This study assumes that participants’ answers to survey questions were accurate and truthful.

E. BENEFITS OF THE STUDY

This study examines the dispositional and motivational variables linked to mentoring intent and behavior among USNA junior officers. It further explores some of the correlates of mentoring, including both psychological and situational variables (i.e., context, job stressors, local concerns). The research findings offer the Naval Academy a

clearer sense of those personality and contextual variables most likely to predict mentoring between officers and midshipmen.

F. ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

The following chapters are included in this study and address the junior officers' mentor perspectives and their mentoring of Naval Academy midshipmen. Chapter II presents a literature review of the concept of mentoring and reviews its analytical trends from the psychological, organizational, and military perspectives. Chapter III explains the methodology used for this study. Chapter IV details this study's results and supporting data analysis. Chapter V offers conclusions derived from this study and recommendations for future areas of research.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. MENTORSHIP 101

As more organizations make mentorship a priority within their ranks, and as research in the area becomes more prominent, our understanding of the mentor-protégé relationship has been increasingly illuminated. While most of the research has focused on how mentor relationships benefit protégé's, a growing number of researchers have shifted focus to the experiences and outcomes for mentors themselves. However, before looking at mentorship through the eyes of the mentor, it is important to understand mentorship broadly.

1. Mentor Functions (Career vs. Psychosocial)

Kram (1985) explained that mentor-protégé relationships are defined in terms of two categories of functions. These are career functions and psychosocial functions. Mentorship career functions are those aspects of the relationship that affect the career advancement of the protégé. Mentors offer career functions when they serve as sponsors to their protégés, heighten protégé exposure and visibility within the organization, coach their protégés, serve as a protective screen for their protégés, or simply assign challenging jobs that help to stimulate growth in their protégé. In contrast, psychosocial functions include those aspects of the mentor relationship that influence the emotional well-being, confidence, self-worth, and ability of the protégé in the professional role. Here the mentor may act as a role model for a protégé, help by accepting and confirming the protégé's purpose and existence within the organization, or help the protégé through counseling or friendship. Mentor relationships may also extend outside the boundaries of the organization and involve a deeper, more intense, and longer lasting experience than most professional and educational relationships (Allen & Poteet, 1999).

2. Phases of a Mentor Relationship

Kram (1983) found mentor-protégé relationships to develop over time in four distinct phases. The initiation phase begins when a junior person in an organization is

drawn to respect a senior member's competence or the senior member identifies a junior that he or she feels is worthy of special guidance or coaching. The initiation phase typically lasts between six months to one year as both the senior and junior member begin to commit to this relationship. Once this relationship is established the relationship shifts into its second phase. In the cultivation phase, both the mentor and protégé come to know and understand the capabilities the other possesses, and both parties optimize the benefits of participating in the mentorship (Chao, 1997). Kram (1983) pointed out that during the cultivation phase many of the mentorship functions are realized and maximized. The cultivation phase lasts anywhere between two to five years. The third phase, termed the separation phase, occurs when the mentorship functions provided by the mentor decrease as the protégé grows in independence. The separation phase can be triggered by any number of occurrences, including transfer or promotion of the protégé or retirement of the mentor. The separation between a mentor and protégé normally lasts between six months and two years. The final phase occurs as the mentor-protégé relationship gradually declines and the dyad's interaction evolves into more informal and infrequent communication and support. This phase, known as the redefinition phase, often sees the mentor and protégé relationship shifting to a collegial friendship between peers.

3. Informal vs. Formal Mentor Relationships

With organizations increasingly recognizing the importance of mentorship to their future growth, many have tried to mandate mentor relationships and create formal mentor programs. Ragins and Cotton (1999) described the differences between formal and informal mentoring relationships. The obvious difference lies in their initiation and early development. An informal mentorship is unplanned and develops spontaneously, whereas formal mentorship relationships develop through organizational intervention and are sometimes initiated through the arbitrary assignment of a protégé to a senior mentor. In other instances, organizations may utilize an elaborate matching process to link mentors and protégés. Most of these organizations assume that the benefits of formally assigned mentor relationships are similar to those common of informal mentorship. (e.g.,

Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Zey, 1985). However, as described below, this assumption is challenged by research outcomes in the mentoring literature.

Ragins and Cotton (1999) described how initiation of the relationship, structure of the relationship, and processes in the relationship differ between formal and informal mentoring. Informal mentoring relationships develop as a result of the career needs of the junior and senior personnel. These relationships develop out of perceived competence and interpersonal comfort (e.g., Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Kram 1983, 1985; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Additionally, mentors typically choose protégés who are high-performers, dubbed rising stars, or ‘hot runners.’ Those members who are a part of informal mentoring relationships often express a joy in working with someone with whom they share a mutual attraction or chemistry (Kram, 1983, 1985). Conversely, formal mentoring relationships limit the choices available to mentors and protégés, provide no flexibility in establishing a connection (e.g., Chao & Walz, 1992; Zey, 1988), and are typically assigned on the basis of application data submitted by potential mentors and protégés. Matching is ultimately left to the discretion of the mentor program coordinator (e.g., Gaskill, 1993; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). These mentoring programs are often so formalized that protégés won’t meet their prospective mentors until after they have been assigned.

Structurally, informal and formal mentoring relationships differ in duration, desired goals, and levels of commitment. It is usual for informal relationships to last between three to six years (Kram, 1985), while formal mentor relationships typically only last, by design, six months to a year (Zey, 1985). Similarly, the goals of formal mentoring are normally predetermined at the outset of any relationship, while in informal mentorships, goals evolve throughout the mentor-protégé relationship (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Additionally, formal or contracted mentor relationships typically focus on individual career goals over the short-term and are therefore primarily concerned with the protégés current position (Ragins & Cotton, 1999), or are designed to accomplish a specific task or develop a specific skill in the protégé (Noe, 1988). By contrast, mentors in informal relationships are more focused on the long-term career development of their protégés.

Finally, mentors in informal relationships naturally spend more time supplying the career and psychosocial development functions than their formal mentor counterparts. This is due to the fact that informal mentors participate of their own volition, not because they are required (Allen & Eby, 2003). Ragins and Cotton (1999) found that protégés in formal relationships often view their mentors as spending time with them as a result of their commitment to the mentoring program rather than a genuine commitment to the protégé.

Ragins and Cotton (1999) also found that protégés with informal mentors report receiving higher levels of career and psychosocial development functions, report higher overall satisfaction with their mentors, and higher overall job satisfaction, than those in formal mentor relationships. Similarly, Chao and Walz (1992) showed that protégés in informal mentoring relationships experienced more career-related support from their mentors, and reported higher salaries than their peers in formal mentoring programs.

4. Gender and Racial Influences on Mentoring

As workplaces increase in diversity, so does the potential for cross-gender or cross-race mentor relationships. Research on cross-gender and cross-race mentorship focuses attention on new variables and both positive and negative effects on the mentor-protégé relationship.

The biggest influence on cross-gender mentoring is stereotypes. Kram (1983) described how stereotypes between men and women can sabotage potential mentor-protégé relationships from the outset. These stereotypes have the potential to negatively effect the perceptions of male and female roles in the workplace, inhibit the role-modeling function of mentoring, breakdown communication, and plant the seeds of distrust between the sexes. Stereotyped gender behavior can create power-struggles or sexual tension within the organization.

Dreher and Cox (1996) found that junior men in organizations typically shy away from choosing senior women as mentors as a result of the perception that females have less power than their counterpart male mentors. That is, female mentors are perceived to have weaker influences on promotion, available resources, and protection available to

their protégés. Similarly, Dreher and Ash (1990) found that men have faster access to mentors and are generally better integrated into mentoring systems. Ragins and Cotton (1993) explained the risks associated with being a female mentor. First, because protégé performance is often seen as a reflection of the sponsor's competency, female mentors may be less willing to put their reputation on the line in order to serve as a mentor. Second, female-female mentor relationships can be perceived as a "female power coalition" and may be met with negativity within the organization. Despite all the negative effects cross-gender mentoring seems to have, Dreher and Ash (1990) found that cross-gender mentoring relationships have a tendency to yield increased gender awareness and can increase output and performance in the long run.

Like gender, race can be an important factor in mentor-protégé relationship development. Thomas (1990) explained that minorities generally believe it necessary for their career advancement to have some form of white-sponsorship, while at the same time maintaining a same-race psychosocial developmental relationship. Although Caucasian protégés rarely have cross-race mentors; African-American protégés must often choose between having no mentor or having a cross-race relationship. Thomas (1990) described how same-race mentoring offers greater psychosocial benefit than those relationships that were cross-racial in nature. Finally, Dreher and Cox (1996) showed that protégés of all races who establish mentor relationships with Caucasian males typically earn the highest salaries.

Ensher and Murphy (1997) argued that formal mentoring programs enable organizations to better incorporate women and minorities into mentor-protégé relationships. They claim that access to mentors can help females and minorities break through major barriers that prevent their ascension to the ranks of leadership within their organization.

5. Mentoring Environments

Kram (1985) described several ways that organizations can create environments that promote mentor relationship formation. In order to establish a mentor-friendly

culture within an organization, one must explore the various obstacles that may inhibit mentoring from taking place. After identifying these obstacles, an organization can begin to determine which intervention strategy best fits its organizational culture and needs.

Kram (1985) defined five obstacles that organizations must overcome. The first major obstacle to a mentor environment exists in organizations that reward bottom-line economic performance results and do not also emphasize human resource development objectives. Second, the nature of the work itself can interfere with the building of mentor relationships when the tasks at hand minimize interaction between junior and senior parties. This is common in organizations where work is highly individualized or independent. Another obstacle is found in performance management systems that attempt to promote coaching and counseling to improve the job performance of junior personnel. Often, the manner in which these programs are introduced causes people to avoid using them, as they suggest performance inadequacies. A fourth challenge to mentoring can be the organization's culture. It is entirely possible that the organization's values, rules, and norms, may actually make mentoring unimportant. Finally, individual attitudes and assumptions about mentoring can also prevent the development of mentor-protégé relationships.

Kram (1985) described two types of strategies for encouraging mentorship. The first strategy focuses on education providing individuals with an awareness and understanding of mentoring -- including the benefits these relationships can have on the mentor and protégé's career development. A second strategy involves structural change within an organization. By changing the current organizational systems in place, companies are able to mold their employees' behaviors to better support the concepts behind mentoring. For example, if a company were to change the way it assigns specific tasks, it may promote interaction between junior and senior employees and, in turn, create a more interactive condition that naturally facilitates mentor relationships. Also, instituting reinforcement or recognition for excellent mentoring would link the reward system to the goal of mentoring.

The first step in choosing the best strategy for creating conditions that encourage mentoring is data collection. Through surveys or interviews, employees on all levels can be called on to provide an overall impression of what factors promote or interfere with establishing mentor relationships. For example, Cesa and Fraser (1989) described how a questionnaire was used by graduate students to evaluate university faculty as advisors and mentors. From these data, organizations may establish objectives and define the scope of an appropriate intervention program. After program objectives are set and obstacles have been identified, alternative strategies for overcoming these obstacles are developed. Finally, after implementing the strategy an organization must have a system in place for evaluating the impact the new conditions have made. This evaluation may identify further steps that could be necessary.

6. Misconceptions about Mentoring

Kram (1985) described five common misconceptions regarding mentor relationships. It is important to recognize these misconceptions if one hopes to fully grasp the dynamics and outcomes of mentorship. The first misconception is that the junior protégé is the primary, or even exclusive, beneficiary in a mentor relationship. In truth, the mentor and the organization stand to gain as much as a protégé through mentorship. A second misconception is that mentors and protégés will always consider the mentor relationship a positive experience. It is fair to say that mentoring can easily become a destructive or negative situation for those involved (Johnson & Huwe, 2002). There is also a frequent misconception that all mentor relationships will be similar in every work setting. In truth, the range of functions, the duration, and the outcomes of mentor relationships vary. A fourth misconception is that mentoring is available to anyone who wants to be mentored. Despite the rise in organizational focus on mentoring, there remains a large number that do nothing to promote mentoring within their structure. Lastly, there exists a misconception that an individual must find a mentor in order to grow and advance in one's career. In fact, many successful employees in a range of settings report having no mentor relationship.

B. MENTORING OUTCOMES

Despite the popular belief that mentoring is used exclusively to mold junior members of an organization, mentor-protégé relationships stand to benefit the mentor and organization as well. Generally, protégé and mentor benefits fall into four categories: career advancement, networking, professional development, and personal identity (Kram, 1985). In addition to the benefits that protégés, mentors, and organizations reap, some negative outcomes are possible once these mentoring relationships have developed.

1. Protége Benefits

Often, the most obvious outcomes of mentoring are those benefits accruing to a protégé. Wright and Wright (1987) summarized the ways protégés benefit from mentoring. First and foremost, having a mentor enhances the career development of junior personnel. Typically, a senior mentor will teach a junior protégé the technical aspects of the profession. Additionally, mentors help protégés define their career aspirations and provide insight as to the ins and outs of maximizing their potential for reaching these professional goals. Kram (1985) explained how being sponsored by a mentor helps junior protégés advance within organizations and further advance in their careers.

Wright and Wright (1987) described networking as a second area of benefit to protégés. By exposing protégés to more senior colleagues and the environments that exist above their professional hierarchical tier, mentors increase the visibility of their protégés within an organization. Kram (1985) explained that increasing a protégé's exposure enables him or her to demonstrate competence in front of senior personnel. Conversely, through protection, mentors are also able to screen their protégés from potentially damaging encounters with senior officials or minimize exposure to situations that are not in the protégés best interest.

Mentors also enhance the professional development of their protégés. In addition to establishing career goals, mentors help protégés understand and navigate their professional environments. Kram (1985) suggested that like athletic coaches, mentors

offer protégés strategies to better accomplish assigned tasks, or garner the recognition they deserve. Mentors also influence the professional development of their protégés by involving them in the political processes that are inherent to all organizations. Wright and Wright (1987) submitted that the career functions of mentoring help give protégés vital insight into organizational norms and expected behaviors.

Wright and Wright (1987) explained how having a mentor helps protégés develop a sense of self-worth within an organization. Both the acceptance and confirmation of a mentor go a long way toward enhancing a protégé's self-image. Kram (1985) also described how mentors who serve as role models for their protégés help to mold their personal identities. A mentor's attitudes, values, and behavior help teach the protégé the accepted and effective way of doing business. Lastly, protégés receive necessary counseling and friendship from their mentors. This helps them to explore concerns or work through conflicts -- both those that are work related and those that extend outside the boundaries of the work environment.

Ultimately, individuals who have been mentored are more successful in their professions. Roche's (1979) study of executives found that those that reported having mentors were better educated, were paid higher salaries, earned more early on in their careers, were more prone to follow a specific career path, and had a higher overall satisfaction with their jobs than their counterparts that were never mentored. More recently, Fagenson (1989) found that individuals who reported being mentored had a higher promotion rate, had what they perceived to be more advantageous career opportunities, and had what they considered more power within their organizations.

2. Mentor Benefits

Like their protégés, mentors have much to gain from mentoring relationships. Whereas mentors serve to help guide their protégés' career development, protégés help to rejuvenate their mentors' careers by providing new life, new ideas, a more up-to-date level of understanding, and a fresh enthusiasm for routine tasks (Wright & Wright, 1987). This new found energy can help to stimulate the senior member's productivity and way

of thinking. Additionally, by establishing trust in a protégé, mentors are able to make their overall jobs more manageable (Dreher & Ash, 1990). Having a trustworthy protégé can afford mentors the opportunity to delegate responsibilities down to the junior member.

Other benefits for the mentor accrue through networking; mentors increase their protégés exposure within the organization while bringing credit upon themselves. Wright and Wright (1987) described how mentors earn the respect of their peers when their protégés appear confident and competent, as well as exhibit the potential they have developed under the guidance of their mentors. Lastly, the relationships their protégés develop through networking increase the mentors' professional spheres of influence.

Perhaps the most important benefit for mentors is the personal identity and sense of meaning that relationships with a protégé help to instill. Wright and Wright (1987) explained how mentors derive intrinsic personal satisfaction from championing a protégé. Mentors share a sense of pride in their protégé's professional achievements and in passing knowledge down to their protégés. Mentors see this as having an enduring effect on the organization as a way of having their legacy live on after they retire.

3. Organization Benefits

It is relatively easy to identify the individual benefits accruing to mentors and protégés, but it is also important to note the benefits that developmental relationships bring to the organization. Mentoring enhances employee motivation, production, and job satisfaction; all of which influence organizational climate and productivity.

Wilson and Elman (1990) explained that there are additional benefits an organization receives from mentoring relationships that can be seen in the long-term health of its social system. This occurs through the strengthening and continuation of a preferred organizational culture. Mentoring enables a company to maintain the values and norms of its culture or even redefine the culture to fit future needs of the organization.

The communication that is born with the development of a mentor-protégé relationship stimulates the transmission of information up and down the hierarchy of an organization. These avenues of information exchange help relay important data to all employees. They insure communication of ideas to senior members that can shape the future of an organization. By having these “deep sensors” in protégés, mentors are able to hear rumblings within an organization long before problems harm the organization (Wilson & Elman, 1990). Additionally, mentor relationships help provide both protégés and mentors with clear feedback as to their job performance and thereby increase organizational effectiveness.

Finally, Wilson and Elman (1990) described how mentorship enables organizations to identify, through input from the mentors, junior personnel who are “fast trackers.” These individuals can be further cultivated by the company through the investment of organizational resources and targeted job opportunities, ensuring that potential value is realized by the company through their retention and eventual promotion. These future managers and executives might have otherwise been overlooked had it not been for their mentor relationships.

4. Negative Outcomes

Though there are many benefits that arise from mentoring, it is important to understand the negative outcomes that also can result from these relationships. Kram (1985) explained that, under certain circumstances, mentor relationships can be detrimental to the protégé, the mentor, and ultimately the organization. Additionally, Scandura’s (1998) study of dysfunctional mentorship showed how mentor relationships breakdown or become difficult for participants.

Wright and Wright (1987) detailed common distractions that can arise from problematic mentor relationships. First, in the initiation phase, mentors may possess ulterior motives for wanting to generate a mentor relationship and exploit their protégés in hopes of furthering their own personal career. Conversely, mentors may be so concerned with the careers of their protégés that they come off as overprotective and end

up preventing them from growing professionally. In later phases, as the protégé becomes more successful, mentors may feel threatened by their protégés' increased capabilities and develop professional insecurities. Finally, the trust necessary in effective mentor relationships is at risk of being betrayed by either the mentor or protégé.

Wright and Wright (1987) described how losing a mentor can be detrimental to a protégé. First, a mentor prematurely ending a mentor relationship can damage a protégé's self esteem or bruise his or her confidence. Conversely, Scandura (1998) explained how a protégé with an abusive, destructive, or egocentric mentor, must choose between staying in this debilitating relationship or suffering the professional consequences of breaking off the relationship with the mentor.

Scandura (1998) also explained how an ongoing imbalance of power within mentor relationships can lead to the break-down of mentorship. Protégés that appear too submissive or are too dependent on their mentors become a hindrance and make for a trying experience. A negative experience for either side of the mentor relationship is risky in terms of both professional and opportunity costs.

C. MENTORS & PROTEGES

Mentoring relationships are consistently recognized as important aspects of career development for both mentors and protégés (e.g., Dreher & Ash, 1990; Kram, 1985). The most significant factors in these relationships are the characteristics the mentor and the protégé each bring to the table. The motivations, personalities, and behavioral traits of both mentors and protégés may help to predict the future development and success of a mentoring relationship.

1. The Mentor

While research concerning mentoring benefits is abundant, research on factors related to willingness to mentor others and mentor behavioral trends is more sparse (Allen, 2002). The professional commitment and time necessary to mentor prevent many potential mentors from choosing to mentor junior personnel. Those who do mentor often

have varying motives that underlie their willingness to enter into a mentoring relationship (e.g., Allen, 2002; Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Kram, 1985). Allen's (2002) study of 391 women in the accounting field, described the dispositional and motivational variables related to the propensity to mentor others. Moreover, Allen (2002) was the first to compare the motivation and behavior of mentors to non-mentors.

Based on career and life stage theories, Allen (2002) suggested that mentors seek out mentoring relationships with protégés primarily to serve their own developmental needs. Additionally, Allen recognized that mentoring a protégé, is a form of prosocial behavior (2002). Within an organization, prosocial behaviors are those that one expects will benefit the person, group, or organization in which the behavior occurs. Allen (2002) described prosocial behavior as a collection of traits that predispose a person toward being helpful, or to express other-oriented empathy. People scoring high in other-oriented empathy are more prone to feel responsible or be concerned about others' welfare. Allen et al. (1997) suggested that mentoring others reflects other-oriented empathy because mentors describe feeling empathetic toward junior colleagues as they face early career challenges.

Helpfulness completes the composition of the prosocial personality. Allen (2002) noted that previous research has linked altruistic personalities with the motivation to mentor others and found that empathy and helpfulness correlate to organizational citizenship behavior. It only follows then that individuals who display empathetic tendencies and are more helpful will mentor others more frequently. Indeed, Allen (2002) found that prosocial dispositions were associated with the propensity to mentor others; however, she considered career oriented and prosocial approaches complementary, rather than competing, processes related to willingness to mentor others.

Willingness to mentor others is also affected by the motives that cause a senior colleague to seek out a protégé. Allen et al. (1997) classified the motives for mentoring as other-focused and self-focused. Other-focused motives include desires to help others, to pass on information to others, and to build a competent workforce. Self-focused motives include a desire to increase personal knowledge or learning and to feel

gratification. Allen (2002) found differences in the variables predicting willingness to mentor others and those relating to actual mentoring behavior. That is, where helpfulness and empathy both lead to a willingness to mentor, they do not necessarily result in actual mentoring. For example, helpfulness had a high relation to actual experience as a mentor, while empathy did not. Allen (2002) held that those who score high on helpfulness are consistently inclined to engage in actions that benefit others. She stated that helpfulness could be a better predictor than empathy of actual mentoring decisions since it has been linked in previous research to self-confidence and self-efficacy.

Additionally, Allen (2002) revealed a comprehensive array of factors relating to the functions in mentor relationships. Results showed that prosocial behavior related to mentoring functions; however, there were differences between the correlates of career and psychosocial mentoring functions. Helpfulness related to career mentoring while other-oriented empathy related to psychosocial mentoring. Allen (2002) suggested that because it reinforces feelings of effectiveness and competence, helpfulness might relate better to career-related mentorship. Similarly, the sponsorship, exposure, and challenges that mentors can provide seem to validate the mentor's existence within the organization. Conversely, the counseling and nurturing that mentors provide appears closely tied into psychosocial mentoring. Those individuals who display higher levels of empathy may foster more of the intimacy and trust that is central to the psychosocial dimension within their protégés.

Along the same lines, Allen (2002) found that mentors who were motivated by different factors provided different mentoring functions. That is, mentors who reported a motivation to mentor for their self-enhancement were likely to provide career mentoring functions. Those who were motivated intrinsically provided psychosocial mentoring. Allen (2002) offered the explanation that "mentors motivated by a desire to increase their overall standing in the organization may not see value in providing the psychosocial functions of friendship and counseling as they don't directly serve the mentor's personal career goals; whereas sponsoring protégés or giving them an opportunity to shine in a highly visible environment can enhance a mentor's career profile" (p. 149). Interestingly,

Allen (2002) also showed that the mentors who were motivated by their desires to help the organization and their protégés, were most likely to provide both types of mentorship.

In conclusion, Allen (2002) offered one particularly interesting implication of her study. She believed her findings implied that protégés may need to try and determine what motives underlie their prospective mentor's willingness to begin a mentor relationship in order to determine whether or not the relationship appears to meet their needs. The current study addressed the motivations and behaviors of junior officer mentors and non-mentors at the Naval Academy. This study serves as an extension and replication of Allen's (2002) findings.

2. The Protégé

Protégé motivation for entering into a mentoring relationship can be closely tied to the benefits they receive through mentorship. The career and psychosocial functions of mentoring offer protégés sponsorship, career guidance, increased self-worth, and organizational identity. Additionally, protégés may be motivated by the challenges or opportunities that mentor relationships can provide in terms of professional growth. Though the vast research on mentoring focuses on how mentor relationships are initiated, comparatively little is known about why mentors choose the protégés they do.

Allen et al. (2000) described the characteristics mentors look for in protégés. Specifically, Allen et al. (2000) identified the personal characteristics and matching variables mentors reported as being the most influential when choosing a protégé. Previous research had shown that two characteristics relate to protégé selection: mentor perceptions of protégé ability or potential, and the protégé's need for help (Allen et al., 2000).

Allen et al. (2000) based their study on a hypothesis rooted in social exchange theory. When an individual perceives a relationship will provide greater rewards than costs, he or she will be more inclined to develop a relationship. In mentorship, this suggests that mentors will choose protégés they believe possess desirable attributes and hence will offer a relationship of mutual satisfaction. Most of the previous research

shows that mentors anticipated greater rewards and thus tended to be more willing to mentor high performing vice lower performing subordinates. However, Allen et al. (2000) found that more recent qualitative research suggests that mentors may also select protégés based on their needs for help or shortcomings the mentor may see in the junior person. This supports the notion of intrinsic motivations of mentors for helping juniors in need.

Barriers to mentoring others may also impact the selection of protégés in an organization. Allen et al. (2000) described these barriers which include time constraints, perceived requirements or qualifications to being a mentor, and personal job challenges or problems. These researchers hypothesized that mentors who perceive barriers to mentoring may be more inclined to choose high performing (less risky) protégés.

Allen et al. (2000) found that a protégé's perceived ability or potential was instrumental in a mentor's selection and was positively related to a mentor's personal advancement ambitions. Interestingly, the study showed perceived barriers to mentoring were negatively related to selecting a protégé based on their perceived ability/potential and suggested that mentors may believe that mentoring a protégé may not be worth the time if the barriers are too great. In conclusion, Allen et al. (2000) provided quantitative evidence that protégés are more likely to be selected by mentors based on their abilities/potential than on their need for help.

D. MILITARY MENTORSHIP

Like most organizations, the military has made mentorship a priority. The benefits that mentor relationships in the military bring to the protégé, the mentor, and the service as a whole, may be vital to the defense of our nation. A recent survey of junior officers in the surface warfare community determined access to mentoring was one of the biggest influences on professional skills, career development, and retention (U.S. Navy, 1999). In 2001, the current Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Vern Clark, challenged all Navy leaders to serve as mentors, as a way to keep sailors in the Navy and stimulate the growth of the service in the future. The CNO emphasized that although military mentor-protégé relationships can be perceived as special treatment of the subordinate, he

clarified that, “what I want is special treatment for all of our naval personnel” (Ham, 2001). The positive effect that mentorship is having on the military has been highlighted in recent studies.

1. Mentoring in the Army

Steinberg and Foley (1999) focused on the dimensions of mentoring in Army mentorships. They surveyed 3,715 active Non-Commissioned Officers (NCOs) and 4,876 active commissioned officers as to their mentor experience in the military. Additionally, Steinberg and Foley conducted structured interviews of 92 NCOs and 31 commissioned officers to determine how they defined mentorship and supplement their survey data and strengthen their findings.

The Steinberg and Foley (1999) study found that 74% of respondents were currently mentoring someone in the Army. More senior NCOs and senior officers (80% of NCOs and 74% of senior officers) tended to mentor than junior officers (54%). Additionally, 84% of respondents claimed they had a mentor at some time in their military career. Forty-seven percent said they were currently being mentored. Of those that were mentored, 95% indicated that their mentors exhibited crucial mentoring behaviors (acting as a role model, providing support and encouragement, protecting you, providing sponsorship-contacts to advance your career, and assisting in obtaining future assignments). The biggest distinctions in rate of mentoring found in the Steinberg and Foley (1999) study were a function of rank, type of position held in the Army, and category of Army organization served in.

Steinberg and Foley (1999) found that there were no gender differences in the proportion of NCOs who said they were currently mentoring. Similarly, a close to equal proportion of male and female officers (70% and 60% respectively) said they currently served as a mentor in the Army. Only a slightly higher percentage of Males reported having mentors than did their female peers (85% to 80%). Among those respondents that did not have a mentor, a higher percentage of females said they would like to have a

mentor than males (20% to 13%). This finding suggests that, despite the male-dominant Army environment, women were not at a significant mentoring disadvantage.

Interestingly, there were no racial differences in being a mentor for either NCOs or officers. Specifically, Steinberg and Foley (1999) found no race (or Race by Gender) differences in (a) percentage of respondents who said they had previously been mentored, (b) types of assistance mentors provided, or (c) helpfulness of mentors.

2. Navy Flag Officers and Mentorship

A recent survey of retired Navy flag officers revealed much about the importance of mentorship in the naval service (Johnson, et al. 1999). Of the 691 admirals responding to the survey, 67% said they were mentored during their naval career. Forty percent reported that their mentoring was mutually initiated, while 39% claimed their mentor took the first step in building a relationship (2% said they initiated finding a mentor). A third of the admirals reported that their mentors were most important during their division officer and department head tours, or the first 5-8 years of their careers. The responding Navy admirals ranked the following mentor activities in order of importance: (1) offering acceptance and encouragement, (2) enhanced my career development, (3) increased my self-esteem, (4) increased my visibility in the Navy, (5) advocated on my behalf, (6) assisted me in establishing professional networks, and (7) provided timely and firm correction when needed. Navy flag officers overwhelmingly recommended educating naval officers about mentoring and encouraged mentoring within all naval organizations. The study also found that more recently promoted admirals were more likely to report having had a mentor than their more seasoned counterparts. This suggests that mentoring may be increasing in frequency in the Navy.

E. MENTORSHIP AT USNA

At the United States Naval Academy (USNA), where the development of midshipmen as future leaders in the Navy and Marine Corps is paramount, mentorship has become a focus of recent studies. In 2001, two major studies were conducted that focused on midshipmen perspectives on mentoring at USNA. Additionally, a 2002 study

looked at USNA faculty perceptions of their role in the mentorship of midshipmen. These studies did much to highlight the importance and benefits that mentoring midshipmen can bring to their future military careers. This research is discussed below.

1. Midshipmen Mentoring Experiences

Johnson et al., (2001) described the prevalence of mentorship among third-year midshipmen. The study found that, of the 576 juniors students (62% of the class), 40% reported having a significant mentor relationship at some point in their careers at USNA. Most midshipmen reported male mentors (87%). In addition, 60% of third-year midshipmen mentors were categorized as senior military personnel. Most mentor relationships started mutually and lasted over two years in duration. In the Johnson et al., (2001) study, psychosocial functions provided by mentors were of higher value to the midshipmen than career functions. The fact that midshipmen described their mentors as having a positive impact and considered their mentor experiences important reiterates the importance of mentoring at USNA.

Baker (2001) surveyed a third of USNA midshipmen, representing a cross-section of members in the graduating classes of 2000 through 2003. Baker's study was designed to determine: (a) the overall prevalence of mentoring at USNA, (b) midshipmen levels of satisfaction with their mentor relationships, and (c) functions and characteristics of their mentors at USNA. The study found that 45% of surveyed midshipmen reported being mentored while at USNA. Among the mentored midshipmen, 48% stated their mentors initiated the relationship, while an equal percentage (47%) reported the relationship began mutually. Over half of the mentor relationships (58%) lasted less than a year, 25% between one and two years, and 17% were over two years in duration. Consistent with previous research, a majority of the mentors at USNA were male. 95% of male midshipmen reported male mentors; and 54% of women had mentors who were men. Mentors came from a number of groups including military officers, civilian faculty, or midshipmen peers. Specifically, midshipmen reported 41.6% of their mentors were military officers, while 30.3% were civilian faculty, and 28.1% were other midshipmen. These mentors provided a number of significant career and psychosocial functions for

their midshipmen protégés. The mentor functions of providing support and encouragement, increasing self-esteem, and offering opportunities were reported most frequently. Baker (2001) found that the overall satisfaction of midshipmen at USNA was positively related to having a mentor. Further, midshipmen who were mentored were more likely to serve as mentors themselves, and those who were mentored were more apt to serve in positions of leadership. This finding emphasized the important role mentors serve in the professional growth of future Navy and Marine Corps officers.

2. USNA Faculty Mentors of Midshipmen

Raithel's (2002) study of Naval Academy faculty focused on their beliefs and behaviors as mentors to midshipmen. Using data from 10 semi-structured interviews, Raithel (2002) researched (a) how faculty mentors conceptualized mentoring and the nature of their mentor relationships, and (b) what faculty mentors do in relation to their midshipmen protégés. Of the ten faculty members that were interviewed, three were active duty military members, and three were female. Interestingly, not all ten described themselves as mentors. However, the research showed that all ten faculty members exhibited behaviors of mentors to their midshipmen, whether they perceived themselves as mentors or not (Raithel, 2002). Additionally, Raithel (2002) found that midshipmen's welfare and success was of most concern to the mentors. The study found that USNA faculty considered both age and experience as important factors in faculty mentors. Nine of the ten faculty mentors preferred informal mentor relationships to formal assignments. The majority felt that formal mentor programs at USNA focused on the completing of a specific task versus the overall development of midshipmen. Raithel (2002) showed that USNA faculty did not perceive gender preference as a factor in the development of mentor relationships. Interestingly, the study concluded that a majority of civilian faculty (5 of 7) did not view themselves as being less influential as mentors to midshipmen than their military counterparts.

3. Existing Mentor Programs

Formal mentoring programs at USNA cover a wide variety of ‘special’ case midshipmen. The newest mentor program at USNA is the Warrior Coach program. This program, administered by the Officer Development Department at USNA, assigns officer ‘coaches’ to midshipmen ‘warriors’ who desire a mentor and volunteer for the program. According to the Warrior Coaching Spirit module, the intent of the Warrior Coach program is to help a midshipman define for him/herself a warrior spirit that they can nurture while at USNA and draw on in future times of stress (Schoultz, 2004). Ideally, midshipmen will come to understand characteristics of spiritual strength that great warriors have in common and then seek to cultivate those characteristics in themselves through their interaction with their officer coaches.

The Naval Academy Officer Development Department also runs a more ‘selective’ and punishment-based program called the USNA Honor Remediation Program. In the Honor Remediation Program, midshipmen who are in violation of the Brigade of Midshipmen Honor Concept and have been retained at the Naval Academy by the honor committee are formally assigned senior faculty “mentors.” These mentors provide counsel and support for individual midshipmen as they reflect and focus on improving their moral reasoning capabilities. (<http://www.usna.edu/CharacterDevelopment/honor/local/honorRemediation.html>). Although the term mentor is applied to these faculty members, it is unlikely that these dyads represent genuine mentorships as described in the research literature.

The Trident Scholar program is one of the rewards-based programs at USNA. It offers midshipmen who are in the top ten percent of their academic class standing an opportunity to advance their education through research projects or graduate education programs while in their senior year at USNA. Being a Trident Scholar empowers midshipmen to seek out “one or more Naval Academy faculty advisors who are well acquainted with the field of study and who will serve as research mentors to the scholar midshipmen (USNA website).” The time trident scholars spend with their faculty members and the proximity in which they work helps to develop this mentor relationship. (<http://www.usna.edu/TridentProgram>)

Another opportunity midshipmen have for exposure to officer mentors at USNA is through their mandatory participation in athletics and extra-curricular activities. USNA requires every varsity and club sport, as well as extra-curricular activities to have a designated commissioned officer representative in place. In this capacity, these officers have the opportunity to exhibit both the career and psychosocial functions of mentoring. [United States Naval Academy COMDTMIDNINST 1310.1(series)]

In addition to their extra-curricular activities, every midshipman attending the Naval Academy is assigned an academic advisor. Though this advisor is designated to focus primarily on the academic development and progress of their assigned midshipmen, the nature of their interaction facilitates the development of mentor relationships in some cases. (<http://www.usna.edu/AcCenter>)

Finally, the USNA Academic Center offers a Plebe Intervention Program designed to target freshmen midshipmen who are deemed at-risk academically and establishes a strong support system that is dedicated to their success at the Naval Academy. In the summer of 2002, 69 plebes were enrolled in this program. Though the emphasis with the Plebe Intervention Program focuses on academic performance, the military experience of the retired officers who serve as advisors affords the opportunities to take the mentor-protégé relationship beyond simply the academic environment at USNA. (<http://www.usna.edu/AcCenter/plebeprograms.html>)

F. SUMMARY

More organizations are looking to mentorship to help develop their leaders. This growing interest has led to an increase in research on the mentor-protégé relationship. The advantages of having a senior role-model to help develop someone professionally, to offer career guidance and coaching, and to build confidence are vital to the success of many protégés. Mentor expertise and the example they set are potentially invaluable to the development of future military leaders at the United States Naval Academy.

This study investigated Navy and Marine Corps junior officers' propensity to mentor USNA midshipmen. Specifically, it identified those factors that motivate officers

at USNA to choose to mentor these developing military leaders. It also described the behaviors junior officer mentors exhibit in their mentoring relationships and the most frequent junior officer mentoring functions. The study examined the extent to which the Naval Academy articulates the importance of junior officer mentorship of midshipmen and offers several recommendations relevant to encouraging midshipmen mentoring at the Naval Academy.

This study defined mentors as “individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing support to and increasing the career advancement of junior organizational members, their protégés” (Allen, 2002, pg. 134).

As the Naval Academy’s mission clearly states, its purpose is to develop future military leaders in mind, body, and character, it seems only right that mentorship play a key role in the growth processes in place at this leadership laboratory. Despite the benefits that clearly can be obtained through effective mentoring relationships, there exists no mention of mentoring in the Naval Academy’s mission statement, strategic goals, or core values. Hence, it is important that this study determine the extent to which junior officers serve as mentors, their key sources of motivation and primary activities in support of developing midshipmen. These findings will help better illuminate this leadership development process at USNA as it serves the overall USNA mission.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. SAMPLE

The entire populations of Navy and Marine Corps junior officers stationed at USNA in January of 2005 were asked to complete the mentorship survey for this study. This included 262 Navy Lieutenants and Lieutenant Commanders and Marine Corps Captains and Majors.

One hundred and forty-eight usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 56.5%. Among the respondents, 104 (70.3%) are LT's, 23 (15.5%) are LCDR's, 10 (6.8%) are CAPT's, and 11 (7.4%) are MAJ's. Time in service ranged from 3 to 22 years with a mean of 10.03 years ($SD=4.49$). Time stationed at USNA ranges from 1 to 10 years with a mean of 2.9 years ($SD=1.24$). Regarding career intentions, 33 (22.3%) intend to stay in over 20 years, 32 (21.6%) intend to retire at 20 years, 26 (17.6%) intend to stay in past their initial obligation but were undecided beyond that, 50 (33.8%) intend to separate from the military after completing their tours at USNA, and 5 (3.4%) intend to separate while still attached to USNA.

Respondents ranged in age from 26 to 47 years with a mean age of 31.0 years ($SD=4.30$). Regarding gender, 117 (79.1%) are male and 31 (20.9%) are female. Concerning ethnicity, 89.2% of respondents describe themselves as Caucasian, 3.4% as Hispanic, 3.4% as African American, and 4.1% classify themselves as "other." Regarding marital status, 43 (29.1%) report being single, 99 (66.9%) are married, and 6 (4.1%) are divorced. Additionally, 62 (41.9%) have children, whereas 86 (58.1%) do not have children.

Regarding level of education, 45 (30.4%) reported having an undergraduate degree, 20 (13.5%) were currently working on a Master's degree or were in Law School, 57 (38.5%) had completed a Master's degree or Law School, 19 (12.8%) were working on or had completed a second Graduate degree, and 7 (4.7%) were working on or had completed a Doctorate degree. 111 (75.0%) reported being graduates of USNA, whereas 35 (23.6) were graduates of another university. Two respondents did not disclose their alma mater.

In terms of primary assignment at USNA, 67 (45.3%) are academic faculty, 43 (29.1%) hold staff positions, 28 (18.9%) are Company Officers, 1 (0.7%) is a coach, and 9 (6.1%) hold “other” positions. It is also typical for junior officers to hold one or more collateral duties while assigned to USNA. As for collateral duties, 64 (43.2%) reported being an Extracurricular Activity/Athletics Officer Representative, 28 (18.9%) are Faculty Advisors, 21 (14.2%) report being a coach, 15 (10.1%) participate in the Midshipman Sponsor program off of the yard, and 42 (28.4%) have “other” collateral duties. Examples of other collateral duties included: Warrior Coach, Plebe Academic Advisor, and instructor.

B. MEASURES

This study’s survey instrument was derived from the questionnaire used in Allen’s study (2002) and slightly modified to better fit the military culture and the experiences of Naval Academy junior officers (See Appendix A for a copy of the survey). The instrument consisted of questions regarding junior officer experiences as both a mentor and a protégé before being stationed at the Naval Academy and their mentoring experiences during their tours at USNA. Additional questions addressed their willingness and motivations for choosing to mentor midshipmen. The survey also included various question sets that covered the specific behaviors exhibited by junior officers in mentor relationships, as well as their overall pro-social behavioral tendencies. The survey concluded with 3 short answer questions designed to capture the junior officers’ perspectives of mentorship at the Naval Academy and a section collecting individual junior officer demographic information. A draft survey was reviewed, critiqued, and approved by members of the USNA faculty and Office of Institutional Research.

As a wide array of definitions for the concept of mentorship exist in the literature, and because research has shown that differences in the interpretation of the mentorship construct can effect survey outcomes, respondents were provided the following definition of mentorship from Allen (2002): “A mentor takes a personal interest in, guides, sponsors, or otherwise has a positive and significant influence on the professional career

development of a junior person or protégé (p. 140).” Specific scales incorporated in the current mentoring questionnaire included the following:

1. Experience as a Mentor

Junior officer respondents answered yes or no to the following two questions: 1) “Have you mentored another person while in the military?” and 2) “Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?”

2. Experience as a Protégé

Respondents answered yes or no to the following question: “Have you been mentored while serving in the military?” Additionally, only those junior officer’s with experience as a protégé reported on the extent they were provided mentoring with an adapted version of Noe’s (1988) Mentor Function Scales used in Allen (2002). The adaptation consisted of rewording the items from a mentor to a protégé perspective. This measure assessed those career and psychosocial mentoring functions described by Kram (1985). Junior officer protégés were asked to indicate the extent that their mentors engaged in specific mentoring behaviors using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (no extent) to 5 (strong extent). Seven items measured career mentoring (e.g., “Gave you assignments that presented opportunities to learn new skills.”) Reliability analysis showed that internal consistency as represented by Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .86. Additionally, ten items assessed psychosocial mentoring (e.g., “Encouraged you to try new ways of behaving in your job.”). Internal consistency was .90. Higher scores indicated a greater degree of a given mentoring function was experienced by the junior officer when he or she was a protégé.

3. Willingness to Mentor

Junior officer willingness to mentor was measured with four items developed by Ragins and Scandura (1994) and used in Allen (2002) (e.g., “I would like to be a mentor” or “I intend to be a mentor.”). The coefficient alpha measuring internal consistency was

.92. Responses were made on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicated a greater willingness to serve as a mentor.

4. Prosocial Personality

Allen's (2002) Prosocial Personality Battery was used to measure other-oriented empathy, helpfulness, personal distress, and collectivism. Twenty-seven items measured other-oriented empathy (e.g., "I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me."). A five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used to measure responses. Internal consistency as assessed by Cronbach's coefficient alpha (α) was .81. Similarly, seven items measured helpfulness (e.g., "I have helped a coworker who I did not know that well with an assignment when my knowledge was greater than his or hers."). Responses were made on a five-point scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Internal consistency as measured by coefficient alpha was .73. Three items measured collectivism, or respondent propensity to socialize (e.g., "I prefer to work with others in a work group than to work alone."). Responses were measured on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal consistency was .79. Lastly, four items measured personal distress, that is, a respondent's tendency to fall apart in stressful situations (e.g., "I tend to lose control during emergencies."). Measured on a five-point scale, responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal consistency was .69. Higher scores reflected greater degrees of other-oriented empathy, helpfulness, collectivism, and personal distress in the junior officers.

5. Mentor Motives

A pool of 19 items based on Allen (2002) was used to assess junior officer motives for mentoring. This portion of the survey instrument was limited to those officers who reported mentoring midshipmen at USNA. Junior officer mentors rated the extent to which each item influenced their decision or motivated them to mentor on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (no extent) to 5 (strong extent). Higher scores indicated that the individual factor was a more powerful motivator. The underlying constructs

were identified through factor analysis. Specifically, a principle component factor analysis by Varimax with Kaiser Normalization rotation was conducted, constraining to a 3-factor solution (the number of factors in Allen's original survey). Three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.8 emerged, representing the 19 items. The first factor consisted of items related to mentor self-enhancement. A second factor represented a motive benefiting others and the organization. Finally, a third factor consisted of items related to the intrinsic satisfaction experienced by the mentor. The factor loadings are presented in Table 1. Self-enhancement was comprised of 6 items ($\alpha=.86$). Benefit others consisted of 9 items ($\alpha=.81$). Intrinsic satisfaction was comprised of 4 items ($\alpha=.84$). This study's factor analysis of mentor motives identifies the same three scales (and constituent items) found in Allen (2002).

6. Mentoring Functions

Junior officers with experience as a mentor reported on the extent to which they provided mentoring with the Mentor Function Scales used in Allen (2002). Again, this measure assessed those career and psychosocial mentoring functions described by Kram (1985). Junior officer mentors were asked to indicate the extent to which they engaged in specific mentoring behaviors using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (no extent) to 5 (strong extent). Seven items measured career mentoring (e.g., "Gave your protégé assignments that presented opportunities to learn new skills.") ($\alpha=.79$). Additionally, ten items assessed psychosocial mentoring (e.g., "Encouraged your protégé to try new ways of behaving in his/her job.") ($\alpha=.88$). Higher scores indicated a greater degree of mentoring provided by the junior officer that focused on a specific function.

Table 1. Factor Loadings of Motives to Mentor Items

Items	Factor 1: Self-Enhancement	Factor 2: Benefit Others	Factor 3: Intrinsic Satisfaction
To enhance your visibility within the organization	<u>.849</u>	-.046	.189
To enhance your reputation within the organization	<u>.797</u>	-.016	.184
To earn respect from others in the organization	<u>.754</u>	.082	.344
To increase your support base within the organization	<u>.730</u>	.262	.115
To have the protégé complete tasks that free up your time at work for other pursuits	<u>.670</u>	.016	.059
To improve your own job Performance	<u>.655</u>	.371	.071
A desire to build/develop a competent workforce within your organization	.075	<u>.739</u>	.110
A general desire to help others	-.168	<u>.699</u>	.236
To ensure that knowledge and information is passed on to others	.077	<u>.686</u>	.046
To benefit your organization	.052	<u>.677</u>	.058
A desire to help others succeed in the organization	-.202	<u>.666</u>	.357
A personal desire to build relationships by working with others	.221	<u>.571</u>	.060
To increase your own personal Learning	.320	<u>.535</u>	.048
To rejuvenate yourself	.386	<u>.509</u>	.286
A desire to help minorities and/or women move through the organizational ranks	.276	<u>.379</u>	-.156
The personal pride that mentoring someone brings	.193	.135	<u>.873</u>
To gain a sense of selfish-satisfaction by passing on insights	.231	.113	<u>.791</u>
A desire to have a influence on Others	.297	.012	<u>.748</u>
The personal gratification that comes from seeing the protégé grow and develop	.032	.428	<u>.647</u>
Eigenvalue	6.01	2.90	1.32
Variance (%)	31.6	15.3	9.5

C. PROCEDURE AND DATA ANALYSIS

In the spring of 2005, each of the junior officers stationed at USNA were sent an email asking them to participate in the web-based “Mentorship Survey.” The web-based survey included a cover letter, a log-in page, and 13 pages covering the 7 different instrument sections. Participation in the Mentorship Survey was voluntary and all junior

officer responses were anonymous. Junior officers were first notified of the survey link by email on a Wednesday and the survey was taken offline Friday of the following week.

One hundred and forty-eight junior officers returned surveys. Respondents who had data missing were dropped on an analysis-by-analysis basis. The surveys were automatically entered into a database by the Department of Institutional Research at USNA.

Analysis of the data was done using an SPSS 12.0 statistical package. Specifically, frequency analysis was used to scrub the data for any coding errors and descriptive statistics helped define the above measures. For reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha coefficient confirmed internal consistency of the measures described above.

Cross tabs and t-tests were used to compare those junior officers who reported mentoring USNA midshipmen with those who were not mentoring at USNA. Contrasts were examined with respect to each of the mentoring measures, demographic characteristics, time in service, career intentions, education level, etc. Due to the limitations a small sample size can have on statistical analysis, a statistical significance level of $p < 0.10$ was used throughout the study, unless otherwise noted.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of the data collection and analysis. First, the prevalence of mentorship being provided by junior officers at USNA is presented. Second, demographic and biographic data are compared. Third, overall willingness to mentor is presented for both junior officer mentors and non-mentors. Fourth, other mentorship measures are analyzed. Fifth, a short answer summary section addresses the main themes and groupings identified in junior officer responses. The final section summarizes the findings of this study's analysis of junior officer mentorship of midshipmen at USNA.

B. PREVALENCE OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

Of the 148 junior officers who completed the survey, 94 (63.5%) reported having served as a mentor for a USNA midshipman. Junior officers reported mentoring a mean of 17.52 midshipmen protégés during their tours at USNA ($SD=47.55$), with a range of 1-400. Table 2 presents the percentage of junior officer that reported mentoring different numbers of midshipmen protégés. The large number of midshipmen that some junior officers claim to mentor (e.g., 20-400) suggests that understanding of the mentorship construct may vary widely in this sample. The largest number of junior officers (38.2%) report mentoring 2-5 protégés.

Table 2. Junior Officer–Midshipmen Mentor Relationships

Number of Midshipmen Mentored	Percentage of Junior Officers Mentors
1	6.4%
2-5	38.2%
6-10	18.1%
11-20	12.8%
21+	23.5%

N = 148

C. DEMOGRAPHIC AND BIOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS

Respondents were asked to provide individual demographic, biographical, and historical information. Chi-square analyses were used to identify trends in those junior officers who choose to mentor. T-tests were also utilized. Gender, race, branch of military service, length of military career and tour at USNA, marital status, status as a parent, career intentions, education level, USNA alumni status, and experiences working at USNA were all considered in these analyses.

1. Gender

As noted earlier, 117 (79.1%) of the respondents were male and 31 (20.9%) were female. While 67.7% of female junior officers claim to mentor as compared to 62.4% of their male counterparts (Table 3), this difference was not statistically significant. Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between whether or not junior officers choose to mentor USNA midshipmen and gender, $\chi^2(1, 148) = 0.30, p = 0.58$.

Table 3. Gender and USNA Mentorship

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	73 (62.4%)	21 (67.7%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	44 (37.6%)	10 (32.3%)	54 (36.5%)
Total		117	31	148

2. Race

From the demographic information provided in the survey instrument, the race variable was coded (0 = non-minority; 1 = minority). This study found only a slight difference (1.1%) between the percentages of non-minorities choosing to mentor at USNA (63.6%) and their minority peers (62.5%). Table 4 illustrates this comparison. Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between race and junior officer decisions to mentor midshipmen, $\chi^2(1, 148) = 0.01, p = 0.93$.

Table 4. Race and USNA Mentorship

		Race		
		Non-Minority	Minority	Total
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	84 (63.6%)	10 (62.5%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	48 (36.4%)	6 (37.5%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	132	16	148

3. Branch of Military Service

This study found that a higher percentage of those junior officers serving in the Marine Corps (76.2%) served as midshipmen mentors than their counterparts in the Navy (61.4%). The comparisons of military branch of service and USNA mentorship are shown in Table 5. While these differences may seem noteworthy, Chi-square analysis showed no significant relationship between branch of service and junior officer mentorship of midshipmen at USNA, $\chi^2(1, 148) = 1.70, p = 0.19$. The lack of statistical significance may be due to the small number of Marines in the sample which limits the power of this statistical analysis.

Table 5. Military Branch of Service and USNA Mentorship

		Military Branch of Service		
		Navy	Marine Corps	Total
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	78 (61.4%)	16 (76.2%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	49 (38.6%)	5 (23.8%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	127	21	148

4. Time in Service and Tour at USNA

Survey questions regarding overall time in military service and the length of junior officer tours at USNA thus far, were used to identify mean differences between

mentors and non-mentors. Table 6 illustrates the significant relationship between time both in military service and at USNA and a junior officer's propensity to mentor. Specifically, Table 5 shows that junior officer mentors had two more years of service and had been at USNA almost a year longer than non-mentors.

Table 6. Time and USNA Mentorship

	Mentor	Non-Mentor	T-test
	Mean & Standard Deviation	Mean & Standard Deviation	
Time in Military Service (years)	$\underline{M} = 10.80$ $\underline{SD} = 4.69$	$\underline{M} = 8.70$ $\underline{SD} = 3.80$	$t(146) = 2.80^{**}$
Time in tour at USNA (years)	$\underline{M} = 3.19$ $\underline{SD} = 1.34$	$\underline{M} = 2.37$ $\underline{SD} = 0.81$	$t(146) = 4.10^{**}$

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

5. Marital Status and Children

The marital status variable was computed to reflect bivariate coding (0 = single; 1 = married). Those junior officers who reported being divorced were considered to be single in the interest of looking at the effect of time constraints on an officer's decision to be a mentor for a USNA midshipman. The analysis found that a 64.6% of married junior officers mentor midshipmen at USNA, while only 61.2% of those that are reportedly single mentor (Table 7). Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between marital status and junior officer mentorship of midshipmen, $\chi^2(1, 148) = 0.17, p = 0.68$.

Table 7. Marital Status and USNA Mentorship

		Marital Status		Total
		Single	Married	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	30 (61.2%)	64 (64.6%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	19 (38.8%)	35 (35.4%)	54 (36.5%)
Total		49	99	148

Similarly, a slightly larger percentage of those junior officers with children mentor midshipmen at USNA. Specifically, 64.5% of junior officers who are parents serve as mentors, while 62.8% of those officers without children decide to mentor midshipmen (Table 8). Again, however, this difference is not significant, $\chi^2 (1, 148) = 0.05$. $p = 0.83$.

Table 8. Children and USNA Mentorship

		Do you have children?		Total
		Yes	No	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	40 (64.5%)	54 (62.8%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	22 (35.5%)	32 (37.2%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	62	86	148

6. Career Intentions

Respondent career intention information provided in the survey instrument was used to compute a bivariate variable (0 = careerist; 1 = non-careerist). Those stating they were “staying in 20+ years,” or “getting out at 20 years,” and “staying in past initial obligation, but am undecided after that,” were classified as careerists, while all others were labeled non-careerist. As might be expected, a higher percentage of career-oriented junior officers mentor midshipmen at USNA (67.7%) than those who are not career-oriented (56.4%). Table 9 illustrates this comparison. Again, Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between a junior officers career intentions and their propensity to mentor midshipmen, $\chi^2 (1, 148) = 1.93$. $p = 0.17$. The exact (1-sided) significance was 0.11 and approached the criterion level of statistical significance ($p < .10$), however, it failed to do so given the Chi-square test’s sensitivity to low sample size.

Table 9. Career Intentions and USNA Mentorship

		Career Intentions		Total
		Careerist	Non-Careerist	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	63 (67.7%)	31 (56.4%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	30 (32.3%)	24 (43.6%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	93	55	148

7. Education

Junior officer respondents were asked to indicate their current level of education. From this information, a bivariate variable was created to reflect differences in education levels (0 = under-grad; 1 = post-grad). Those stating they had “an undergraduate degree” were labeled under-grads, while all other respondents were considered post-grads. A larger percentage of those junior officers having some level of post-graduate schooling were inclined to mentor a midshipman at USNA (67.0%) than those junior officers who only had an undergraduate degree (55.6%). Table 10 reflects this comparison. However, Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between a junior officer’s level of education and their decision whether to mentor midshipmen or not, $\chi^2(1, 148) = 1.77$, $p = 0.18$.

Table 10. Education Level and USNA Mentorship

		Level of Education		Total
		Post-Grad	Under-Grad	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	69 (67.0%)	25 (55.6%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	34 (33.0%)	20 (44.4%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	103	45	148

Finally, respondents were asked whether or not they themselves were graduates of USNA. Only a slightly higher percentage of those junior officers who received their

commission from the Naval Academy mentor midshipmen (64.6%) as compared with their peers who attended another university (60.0%). Table 11 illustrates this comparison. Again, Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between a junior officer's alma mater and their mentorship of midshipmen at USNA, $\chi^2 (1, 148) = 0.24, p = 0.62$.

Table 11. Alma Mater and USNA Mentorship

		College		Total
		USNA	Other	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	73 (64.6%)	21 (60.0%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	40 (35.4%)	14 (40.0%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	113	35	148

8. Previous Mentor Experience

Chi-square analysis showed that a significant relationship exists between having previously been a protégé in a mentor relationship and choosing to mentor midshipmen, $\chi^2 (1, N=148) = 7.47, p < .01$. Specifically, 69.6% of those junior officers who have previously been mentored while serving in the military mentor USNA midshipmen; and 55.6% of those officers who have never been mentored are not serving as mentors at USNA (Table 12).

Table 12. Protégé Experience and USNA Mentorship

		Have you been mentored while serving in the military?		Total
		Yes	No	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	78 (69.6%)	16 (44.4%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	34 (30.4%)	20 (55.6%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	112	36	148

Like previous experience as a protégé, previous experience as a mentor in the military had a significant relationship with junior officers choosing to mentor midshipmen [$\chi^2 (1, N=148) = 49.89, p < .001$]. At USNA 77.3% of those junior officers who have previously served as a mentor in the military reported they are mentoring midshipmen. Conversely, 93.1% of those who have never mentored someone in the military also choose not to mentor a midshipman. Interestingly, 22.7% of those who have previously mentored someone in the military decide not to serve as mentors to midshipmen protégés (Table 13).

Table 13. Mentor Experience and USNA Mentorship

		Have you mentored another person while in the military?		Total
		Yes	No	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	92 (77.3%)	2 (6.9%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	27 (22.7%)	27 (93.1%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	119	29	148

9. USNA

In order to determine the effect that USNA itself has on junior officer's willingness to mentor midshipmen, the survey asked the following question: "Have you received training on how to be a mentor since reporting to USNA?" Results show that a higher percentage of the junior officers who have received some type of mentorship training while at USNA choose to mentor than do those JO's who have received no training. Specifically, respondents who reported that they had received training on mentorship, mentor midshipmen at a rate of 81.3% while only 62.0% of those who have not been trained are serving as midshipmen mentors (Table 14). Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between the mentorship training a junior officer receives at USNA and their decision to mentor a midshipman, $\chi^2 (1, 145) = 2.29, p = 0.13$. The exact significance was $p=0.11$ and approached the criterion level of statistical significance ($p<.10$). Though not significant, it is worth noting that only 16 officers

report having received any type of training on mentorship while serving at USNA. Most likely this training was informal in nature as there is not formal mentorship training program for junior officers in place at USNA.

Table 14. USNA Mentor Training and USNA Mentorship

		Have you received training on how to be a mentor since reporting to USNA?		Total
		Yes	No	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	13 (81.3%)	80 (62.0%)	93 (64.1%)
	No	3 (18.8%)	49 (38.0%)	52 (36.5%)
Total		16	129	148

Additionally, junior officers were asked the question: “Has anything at USNA prevented or inhibited you from developing mentorship relationships with midshipmen?” A larger percentage of those that answered ‘no’ to the question above are mentoring midshipmen (65.2%) than those junior officers who felt barriers to mentorship indeed existed at USNA (58.3%), though this difference is not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 148) = 0.55, p = 0.46$. Table 15 illustrates these differences.

Table 15. Mentorship Barriers and USNA Mentorship

		Has anything at USNA prevented or inhibited you from developing mentorship relationships with midshipmen?		Total
		Yes	No	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	21 (58.3%)	73 (65.2%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	15 (41.7%)	39 (34.8%)	54 (36.5%)
Total		36	112	148

Junior officers were also asked the question: “Does USNA reward mentoring?” The results show only a trivial difference between those who mentor and those who do not. Specifically, 64.9% of those junior officers who feel that ‘yes’ USNA does reward

mentoring, are mentoring midshipmen, whereas 63.1% of those who feel USNA does not reward mentoring still choose to serve as a mentor for midshipmen (Table 16). Chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship between rewarding mentorship at USNA and a junior officer's decision to mentor midshipmen, $\chi^2 (1, 148) = 0.04, p = 0.84$.

Table 16. Rewarding Mentorship and USNA Mentorship

		Does USNA reward mentoring midshipmen?		Total
		Yes	No	
Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA?	Yes	24 (64.9%)	70 (63.1%)	94 (63.5%)
	No	13 (35.1%)	41 (36.9%)	54 (36.5%)
	Total	37	111	148

D. MENTOR MOTIVATION & DISPOSITION

Table 17 presents the intercorrelations, means, and standard deviations of the study variables. Of note, Table 15 highlights how 'Other-Oriented Empathy' (.27) is positively correlated ($p < .01$) to 'Willingness to Mentor', while 'Personal Distress' (-.22) has a negative correlation ($p < .01$) of similar significance. It is also worth noting that 'Intrinsic Satisfaction' (.59) is highly correlated ($p < .01$) to 'Benefit Others'. Conversely, it is interesting to note that 'Personal Distress' has a predominantly negative correlation to the other mentor measures: "Willingness to Mentor," "Other-Oriented Empathy," and "Helpfulness" ($p < .01$). Of the 4 personality variables (#2-5), all but "Helpfulness" are significantly correlated ($p < .01$) with the attitude of "Willingness to Mentor." Of the 3 motivation variables, only "Benefit Others" is significantly correlated ($p < .01$) with "Willingness to Mentor." The "Collectivism" variable only has a significant negative correlation with the mentor motive variable "Self-Enhancement" ($p < .01$).

Table 17. Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations Among Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Willingness to Mentor	-						
2. Other-Oriented Empathy	.273**	-					
3. Helpfulness	.046	.322**	-				
4. Collectivism	.168*	.139	.042	-			
5. Personal Distress	-.224**	-.202*	-.361**	.015	-		
6. Self Enhancement	-.046	.017	.087	-.183*	.097	-	
7. Benefit Others	.381**	.356**	.144	-.180	-.078	.423**	-
8. Intrinsic Satisfaction	.145	.054	-.034	-.105	.047	.424**	.592**
Mean	4.25	3.86	3.13	2.93	1.68	1.85	3.69
SD	0.82	0.35	0.61	0.87	0.51	0.79	0.64

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

1. Willingness

All respondents were asked to use a 5-point scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) to rate their attitudes toward mentoring. These attitudes were analyzed to determine if they predicted actual mentoring behavior. As expected, those junior officers who are mentoring midshipmen displayed a significantly higher willingness to mentor than those who do not choose to mentor, $t(147)=6.75$, $p<.001$. Specifically, those who choose to mentor had a ‘willingness’ mean score of 4.55 compared to a mean of 3.72 for those that do not mentor midshipmen.

2. Prosocial Personality

The Prosocial Personality section of the survey instrument was used to compute the variables: Other-Oriented Empathy, Helpfulness, Collectivism, and Personal Distress. All four variables were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale with ‘1’ representing a low demonstration of the trait. Table 18 illustrates the effect that each of these variables had on a USNA junior officer’s decision to mentor midshipmen.

Table 17 showed that three of the four pro-social variables are significantly correlated with the attitudinal variable “Willingness to Mentor.” However, only “other-oriented empathy” is significantly related to actual mentor behavior as shown in the results presented in Table 18. Specifically, those who are mentoring midshipmen have a higher mean rating of other-oriented empathy ($M=3.89$) than those who are not mentoring ($M=3.79$). Junior officer responses to questions designed to gauge how often they took part in activities that exhibited ‘helpfulness’ showed that despite mentors reportedly being slightly more helpful than non-mentors, this measure did not have a significant effect on their decisions to mentor or not (Table 18). As with the other-oriented empathy and helpfulness, collectivism did not have a significant effect on junior officer mentorship of USNA midshipmen despite mentors reporting a small advantage over non-mentors in their levels of collectivism (Table 18). Lastly, even though junior officer mentors reported lower levels of personal distress than non-mentors, this difference did not reach the criterion level for statistical significance.

Table 18. Prosocial Personalities and USNA Mentorship

	Mentor	Non-Mentor	t-test
	Mean & Standard Deviation	Mean & Standard Deviation	
Other-Oriented Empathy	$\underline{M} = 3.89$ $\underline{SD} = 0.32$	$\underline{M} = 3.79$ $\underline{SD} = 0.38$	$t(146) = 1.75^*$
Helpfulness	$\underline{M} = 3.17$ $\underline{SD} = 0.58$	$\underline{M} = 3.07$ $\underline{SD} = 0.65$	$t(144) = 0.96$
Collectivism	$\underline{M} = 2.99$ $\underline{SD} = 0.83$	$\underline{M} = 2.84$ $\underline{SD} = 0.92$	$t(146) = 1.01$
Personal Distress	$\underline{M} = 1.64$ $\underline{SD} = 0.49$	$\underline{M} = 1.75$ $\underline{SD} = 0.54$	$t(146) = -1.34$

* $p < .10$

3. Mentor Motives

The mentor motive construct measures three sources of motivation: self-enhancement, benefit others and the organization, and intrinsic satisfaction. As with the previously described personality variables, the mentor motive variables were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (No extent) to 5 (Strong Extent). The mean values displayed in Table 19 for each of the motive measures show that junior officers are more motivated by potential benefit to others and the organization, and by intrinsic satisfaction, rather than by self-enhancing motives.

Table 17 showed that of the three mentor motivation variables only “Benefit Others” is significantly correlated to “Willingness to Mentor.” However, none of the three mentor motivation measures were found to be significantly different when comparing those who actually mentor with those who do not. Although not statistically significant, analysis displayed in Table 19 shows that the patterns of mean differences are all in the direction to be expected (i.e., higher ratings of motivation for those who are mentoring as compared with those who are not.)

Table 19. Mentor Motives and USNA Mentorship

	Mentor	Non-Mentor	t-test
	Mean & Standard Deviation	Mean & Standard Deviation	
Self-Enhancement	$\underline{M} = 1.82$ $\underline{SD} = 0.76$	$\underline{M} = 1.94$ $\underline{SD} = 0.91$	$t(117) = -0.68$
Benefit Others & Organization	$\underline{M} = 3.71$ $\underline{SD} = 0.63$	$\underline{M} = 3.60$ $\underline{SD} = 0.69$	$t(117) = 0.73$
Intrinsic Satisfaction	$\underline{M} = 3.48$ $\underline{SD} = 0.98$	$\underline{M} = 3.40$ $\underline{SD} = 0.98$	$t(117) = 0.36$

E. MENTOR FUNCTIONS

All junior officer respondents who had been previously mentored in the military were asked to indicate the extent to which their mentors exhibited certain mentor functions. Each function was scored on a Likert scale from 1 (No Extent) to 5 (Strong Extent).

1. Mentor Functions as a Predictor of Mentoring

Mentor functions are broken down into two primary categories: those that focus on career and those that focus on psychosocial development. Table 20 illustrates the extent to which either career or psychosocial functions experienced by junior officers when they were protégés influenced their decisions to mentor midshipmen at USNA. Table 20 shows that, as protégés, junior officer mentors experienced more mentoring on career issues than those who chose not to serve as a mentor at USNA (N=88). Junior officer mentors also reported experiencing slightly more psychosocial mentoring as compared with JO's who have chosen not to mentor at USNA. While the means are in the direction that would be expected, t-tests were not found to be significant. With a larger sample this finding may have been shown to be significant.

Table 20. Mentor Functions and USNA Mentorship

	Mentor as a Protégé	Non-Mentor as a Protégé	t-test
	Mean & Standard Deviation	Mean & Standard Deviation	
Career Functions	$\bar{M} = 3.18$ $\bar{SD} = 0.90$	$\bar{M} = 2.73$ $\bar{SD} = 1.00$	$t(86) = 1.52$
Psychosocial Functions	$\bar{M} = 3.49$ $\bar{SD} = 0.85$	$\bar{M} = 3.41$ $\bar{SD} = 0.74$	$t(86) = 0.32$

2. Mentor Functions Practiced by Junior Officers at USNA.

Data on mentoring functions were also gathered from all junior officers who reported mentoring midshipmen at USNA. The scores assigned to each of the mentor career and psychosocial functions were analyzed at the individual item level. The primary purpose of this analysis was to identify which functions are most commonly practiced by JO's who are serving as mentors to midshipmen. In order to determine which functions were most evident, junior officer responses of either 4 (Large Extent) and 5 (Strong Extent) were combined to get the percentage of mentors who emphasize each function in their interactions with midshipmen protégés. The items were then ranked according to frequency. For example, 88.3% of junior officers reported exhibiting to a "Strong Extent" or a "Large Extent" the function "conveyed feelings of respect for your protégé as an individual" (Table 21). It is worth noting that the ten psychosocial functions were ranked higher than the seven career functions (Table 21). This is most likely the case because the environment and mission at USNA are designed to support and integrate midshipmen into the military culture. USNA places less focus on promoting military careers. Additionally, the two most infrequent psychosocial functions can easily be interpreted by mentors as dealing with influencing the careers of their protégés. Interestingly, the three least frequent psychosocial functions (i.e., "Encouraged your protégé to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from his/her work") all address anxiety, behavioral concerns, and stressors that accompany advancement. The infrequencies of these functions suggest the potential value in training junior officer mentors in these more challenging aspects of the mentor relationship.

Table 21. USNA Junior Officer Mentor Functions

Functions	Mentors at USNA	
Conveyed feelings of respect for your protégé as an individual (P)	88.3%	$\bar{M} = 4.43$ $SD = 0.65$
Demonstrated good listening skills in conversations with your protégé (P)	83.0%	$\bar{M} = 4.17$ $SD = 0.80$
Kept feelings and doubts your protégé shared with you in strict confidence (P)	79.8%	$\bar{M} = 4.28$ $SD = 1.00$
Shared history of your own career with your protégé (P)	79.7%	$\bar{M} = 4.12$ $SD = 0.81$
Discussed questions or concerns your protégé may have had regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors, or work/family conflict (P)	75.5%	$\bar{M} = 3.96$ $SD = 1.11$
Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your protégés problems (P)	69.2%	$\bar{M} = 3.93$ $SD = 0.88$
Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings that your protégé discussed with you (P)	67.0%	$\bar{M} = 3.87$ $SD = 0.93$
Encouraged your protégé to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from his/her work (P)	63.8%	$\bar{M} = 3.89$ $SD = 1.01$
Encouraged your protégé to try new ways of behaving in his/her job (P)	62.8%	$\bar{M} = 3.82$ $SD = 1.09$
Encouraged your protégé to prepare for advancement (P)	57.4%	$\bar{M} = 3.70$ $SD = 0.97$
Gave your protégé assignments that presented opportunities to learn new skills (C)	53.2%	$\bar{M} = 3.55$ $SD = 1.03$
Gave your protégé assignments or tasks that prepared him/her (you) for promotion (C)	37.2%	$\bar{M} = 3.02$ $SD = 1.31$
Helped your protégé finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete (C)	25.5%	$\bar{M} = 2.71$ $SD = 1.18$
Helped your protégé meet new colleagues (C)	23.4%	$\bar{M} = 2.68$ $SD = 1.06$
Assigned responsibilities to your protégé that increased the protégés contact with people in the organization who could judge the protégés potential for future advancement (C)	22.4%	$\bar{M} = 2.52$ $SD = 1.18$
Gave your protégé assignments that increased written and personal contact with senior management (C)	20.2%	$\bar{M} = 2.48$ $SD = 1.21$
Reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of your protégé receiving a promotion (C)	17.0%	$\bar{M} = 2.28$ $SD = 1.18$

(C) Career Function

(P) Psychosocial Function

F. SHORT ANSWER

Three open-ended, short answer questions were given to the junior officer respondents at the conclusion of the survey. Two questions focused on barriers or inhibitors to mentoring that may exist at USNA and reward systems for mentoring that may or may not be in place at USNA. The third question gave junior officers an opportunity to offer their feelings and opinions about mentorship at USNA. The detailed results are included in Appendix B.

Question number one asked “Has anything at USNA prevented or inhibited you from developing mentorship relationships with midshipmen?” Of the 38 junior officers

that chose to answer the first question, over half (N=26) said time constraints or workload prohibited them from engaging in mentor relationships with midshipmen. Additionally, 6 junior officers noted that being a Company Officer and the requirements of that role prohibited them from developing mentor-protégé relationships with midshipmen.

The second question asked, “Does USNA reward mentoring midshipmen?” Of the 81 junior officers providing answers to this question, 20 clearly felt that USNA does not reward mentoring, while only 5 thought that USNA does reward mentors in some way. Additionally, 31 specifically said that while USNA may reward mentoring, it should not and suggest that the reward for mentoring should be intrinsic. Many of these officers said that mentoring rewards are “gained through the relationship itself,” or “seeing your midshipmen improve.” Twelve junior officers also said something to the effect of “mentoring is part of the job and we shouldn’t be rewarded for just doing our jobs.” The responses reflect ambivalence and heterogeneity in views on this topic.

The final question asked junior officer respondents to “Please offer any personal reflections or observations about junior officers serving as mentors or about mentoring as a whole at USNA.” The predominant theme from the 17 officers who answered this question centered on the culture at USNA. Specifically, 11 respondents said that the “culture at USNA needs to shift to encourage more mentoring,” or something to that effect. Similarly, five of these officers said that junior officers are often forced to become “enforcers” of the rules and regulations at USNA, and felt this precludes them from being potential mentors for midshipmen. Interestingly, four junior officers said they themselves would benefit from better mentoring by senior officers. Lastly, two junior officers expressed concern about a formal mentorship program being put in place at USNA, saying that any such program would “force the issue” and detract from true mentor relationships.

G. SUMMARY

This chapter reported results from a survey instrument provided to all junior officers at USNA. Though there were differences between junior officers who mentor and those who do not on several variables, most between-group variables were not

statistically significant. In the next chapter, the researcher discusses the findings of this study; compares these findings with previous research conducted on mentorship, and offers conclusions based on the results. Additionally, recommendations are offered for USNA to further the benefits derived from junior officer mentorship of midshipmen. Recommendations for future research are also discussed.

V. CONCLUSION

This was the fourth study to assess mentoring relationships at the United States Naval Academy and the first to look at mentor perspectives through the eyes of junior officers. Even as mentoring grows in popularity, studies of mentorship in the military remain few and far between. This chapter highlights the major findings of this study and outlines implications most pertinent to USNA and the military as a whole.

A. DISCUSSION

The finding that 63.5% of junior officers at USNA report mentoring midshipmen raises some interesting issues when compared to previous studies of mentoring in the military. Steinberg and Foley's (1999) study found that 80% of NCO's and senior officers were mentoring someone in the Army, while only 57% of junior officers reported serving as a mentor to their protégés in the Army. Similarly, Johnson, et al.'s (1999) study of Navy Flag Officers found that 67% of Admirals reported being mentored throughout their career. At the Naval Academy, Baker's (2001) study of midshipmen perspectives of mentorship found that 45% of midshipmen report being mentored. This implies junior officers at the Naval Academy are mentoring at a rate higher than those in the Army and a rate consistent in the flag ranks of the Navy. If a common or baseline understanding of the mentorship construct exists throughout these studies and less than half of current USNA midshipmen are being mentored, it appears there may not be enough junior officers to mentor.

Even though this study found that those junior officers who choose to mentor midshipmen report a higher level of willingness to mentor than those who do not mentor, the results show that all junior officers who participated in this study are willing to mentor to some degree. The greater willingness to mentor displayed by junior officer mentors supports Allen's (2002) finding that prosocial dispositions were associated with the propensity to mentor others. Additionally, this study found that decisions to mentor were related to levels of other-oriented empathy—something reported by Allen (2002). In general, those junior officers at the Naval Academy who exhibit higher levels of

empathy, one component of emotional intelligence, will be more prone to serve as mentors for midshipmen. The fact that not all of those who are willing to mentor ultimately engage in mentorships implies that factors beyond willingness influence mentor behavior.

The results of the present study also reveal some comprehensive trends that illustrate the propensity for mentorship by junior officers at USNA. Unlike previous studies regarding demographic and biographical characteristics of junior officers, this study found that there was no difference in junior officer mentoring based on gender; something confirmed by Steinberg and Foley's (1999). Although Steinberg and Foley reported that women tend to mentor at a lower rate, they also found that a higher percentage of females desire mentoring. One reason for this could be that they are often seen as having less time for mentoring while juggling family demands. Additionally, Baker (2001) found that a larger percentage of female midshipmen reported being mentored than did male midshipmen. Although the Naval Academy is a predominantly male culture, male and female junior officers mentor at the same rate.

This study found that career-oriented junior officers at USNA mentor at a higher rate than their peers who are not planning on making the military a career. Wright and Wright (1987) explained that while mentors serve to help guide their protégés' career development, protégés help to rejuvenate their mentors' careers by providing new life, new ideas, a more up-to-date level of understanding, and a fresh enthusiasm for routine tasks. Junior officers who have made the decision to make the military a career likely have a higher vested interest in the development of their protégés, who could one day serve under their command. Additionally, these careerists may be looking to improve both the Naval Academy and the naval service. Junior officers who are dedicated to a career of military service could be considered better organizational citizens with regard to commitment to junior organization members.

This study also found that Marine Corps junior officers mentor at a higher rate than their Navy counterparts. While no research has focused on Marine Corps mentorship, it is possible that the dedication of USMC officers to the study of leadership principles early in their careers has made mentorship an embodied part of the USMC

culture. Despite this finding being a trend that is not statistically significant, it appears that the Naval Academy would be well served by increasing the percentage of junior Marine officers in the overall junior officer population at USNA.

Previous mentor experience was also shown to be associated with propensity to be a mentor in this study. Baker (2001) found that a large percentage of upperclass midshipmen who reported having been mentored while at the Naval Academy decided to become a mentor to subordinate midshipmen themselves. Junior officers at USNA show a similar pattern; a larger percentage of those who have previously been mentored serve as a mentor to midshipmen than those junior officers who have not had a mentor during their military career. Additionally, the present study found that those junior officers who had previously mentored someone in the fleet prior to arriving at USNA mentored midshipmen at a much higher rate than those junior officers who had never mentored. The values gained by junior officers from these previous mentor relationships may serve to make them more motivated to serve as a mentor.

As Kram (1983) pointed out, it takes time for the phases of mentor relationships to develop. Specifically, this study found that those junior officers who reported being mentors to midshipmen, had been stationed at the Naval Academy over three years, while non-mentors only two years. This implies that duration of junior officer- midshipman exposure is positively related to development of mentorships. It appears that junior officer-midshipmen mentor relationships take an average of three years to fully develop. If this is true, the Naval Academy would be well served to lengthen the tours of its junior officers stationed on the yard.

Training in mentorship was also found to be related to junior officer propensity to mentor midshipmen in this study. Those junior officers who had received some form of mentor training from their superiors were more inclined to mentor at the Naval Academy. Certainly, education can open junior officer eyes to the importance of mentoring midshipmen at USNA and their roles as potential mentors. At USNA, where very few junior officers reported being trained on mentorship, senior leaders who overtly value mentoring and emphasize the junior officer mentor role can help create a culture at the Naval Academy that promotes the mentoring of its midshipmen.

Interestingly, this study found that all ten psychosocial functions of mentoring were rated higher than any of the seven career functions. This supports findings from Johnson et al. (2001). Additionally, Johnson, et al.'s (1999) study found that Navy Flag Officers reported that 'enhancing their self-esteem' was one of the most important functions their mentors provided them. This result may be a direct testament to the mission of the Naval Academy. As the USNA mission statement says, the organization's purpose is to develop midshipmen morally, mentally, and physically; and the organizational culture at the Naval Academy is tailored to meet those goals. Hence, junior officer mentors may focus more on the character development of their midshipmen, than on pointing their protégés in the right direction career-wise. The military structure also appears to put more emphasis on the psychosocial aspects of development in the early stages of a member's time in the military. Early in their careers, junior officers have a set schedule for advancement as they are promoted typically every two years. Additionally, most naval warfare communities (i.e. Surface Warfare, Aviation, Submarine Warfare, etc.) have a standard career pipeline that their respective junior officers must follow. Because, in these early stages, career advancement is very prescribed, junior officer mentors may perceive more opportunity to be influential in focusing on the psychosocial development of protégés.

Kram (1985) predicted and Allen et al. (2000) found that time is reported to be the biggest barrier to developing mentor relationships. This study of Naval Academy junior officers was no different. A number of junior officers stated in their qualitative comments that time constraints caused by their jobs limited their interaction with midshipmen and ultimately detracted from their willingness to mentor. As with previous research, time was seen to be the biggest barrier to mentoring at the Naval Academy. Obviously, time on the job, primary and collateral job requirements, family obligations, and other outside interests all place demands on potential junior officer mentors time while stationed at USNA.

This study found that while the Naval Academy does not reward junior officers who choose to mentor midshipmen, many junior officer mentors felt the only true reward for mentoring is the intrinsic satisfaction gained from mentoring midshipmen and seeing

them succeed. This is exactly what Wright and Wright (1987) proposed when explaining how mentors derive personal satisfaction from championing their protégés. Junior officers who mentor at USNA appear inclined not to anticipate extrinsic reward for their efforts. While this finding was evident in qualitative comments, there were mixed findings in the survey results. The motivation “to benefit others and the organization” was found to be related to willingness to mentor, but neither this nor the other two sources of motivation were significantly related to actual mentor behavior. This suggests there is some other explanation for what distinguishes those who mentor from those who do not. Future research in the area of junior officer mentorship at USNA should attempt to gather further evidence of what inhibits those who don’t mentor, even when they show personality characteristics and motivations similar to those who do mentor.

While Allen (2002) reported that mentors are predominantly motivated to mentor a protégé for the purposes of enhancing their own personal careers, this study found that Naval Academy junior officers were more motivated to mentor through ‘benefiting others or the organization.’ Perhaps the structure of the military promotion system relieves the pressure to use protégés for self-advancement; or junior officers may be more inclined to deny extrinsic motivations. It is reasonable to assume that motivations may vary between military and civilian business context. In order to gain a deeper understanding into the motivation of mentors in the military, similar studies could be conducted at other American military installations.

B. SUMMARY

Though this study was unable to replicate all of Allen’s (2002) findings, it did serve to reemphasize some of the results found in Johnson et al. (2001), Baker (2001), and Raithel (2002). Like Johnson et al. (2001), the present study found that the psychosocial functions are most descriptive of mentoring activities at the Naval Academy. It appears that in the service academy environment, emotional and relational components of mentoring are more salient than career components. Baker (2001) reported that a midshipman’s overall satisfaction of the Naval Academy was positively related to having a mentor. The present study’s finding that a junior officer mentor’s

primary motivation for mentoring a midshipman can be characterized as benefiting others and the organization contradicts Allen's findings that the most significant source of motivation is self-enhancement, but is consistent with Baker's results.

The results of this study were also consistent with Raithel's (2002) research in two ways. First, the faculty mentors in Raithel's (2002) study said age and experience were important characteristics in successful faculty mentors. Similarly, this current study found junior officer mentors had more previous mentor experience and were older than their non-mentor peers. Additionally, Raithel (2002) showed that USNA faculty mentors did not perceive gender to be a factor in the development of mentor relationships. The current study supported Raithel's (2002) findings that junior officer gender had no impact on propensity to mentor.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

The current research found that 63.5% of junior officers stationed at the Naval Academy are serving as mentors to midshipmen. It also found that those junior officers who are not mentoring report a willingness to do so. This suggests there is an untapped potential and the Naval Academy could take steps to encourage these officers to choose to be mentors. Although it is difficult to compare this rate to any college-level baseline—no previous research offers comparative data—it behooves USNA to consider whether this prevalence rate is desirable or acceptable in light of the USNA mission.

There are a number of things that the Naval Academy can do to increase the number of junior officers who are willing to serve as mentors to its midshipmen in the future. First, by selecting junior officers who report being mentored in the fleet and by increasing the number of career-minded officers it selects for service at USNA, the Naval Academy administration can build a pool of junior officers that are willing to mentor. Soliciting recommendations from the junior officers' mentors in the fleet may help gauge the potential officer's willingness to mentor when they arrive at USNA.

The Naval Academy should most certainly not institute a formal mentorship program that assigns protégés with prospective mentors. Forcing the issue is not the answer. Ragins and Cotton (1999) reported that protégés in informal mentor

relationships received higher levels of career and psychosocial development functions, and were more satisfied with their jobs, than those in formal mentor relationships. However, the current results highlight the importance of the Naval Academy and its junior officers in taking a proactive approach to establishing these relationships. USNA could institute a training program that focuses on introducing junior officers to the fundamental concept of mentoring, the art of mentorship, and the benefits these relationships can produce. Such a training program could increase the proclivity for junior officers to choose to mentor midshipmen. Additionally, training the brigade of midshipmen on the benefits of mentoring could increase their propensity to seek out mentors in the junior officer ranks.

This study reveals that while a good number of junior officers stationed at USNA are fulfilling their potential as a leadership resource by mentoring midshipmen, the Naval Academy could do more to realize the untapped potential mentor resources at their disposal in the overall junior officer population's willingness to mentor. By taking the necessary steps to build upon junior officer willingness and motivations to mentor and to identify and diminish barriers to the mentor-protégé relationship, the Naval Academy may get more junior officers to mentor midshipmen and help meet its overall mission.

D. LIMITATIONS

First and foremost, despite this study's use of one standard mentorship definition, the wide range of conceptions surrounding mentoring serve as a methodological weakness. A weakness in previous studies as well, these misconceptions highlight a problem with the mentoring construct. Certainly junior officers at the Naval Academy who reported mentoring between 20-400 midshipmen would define mentoring differently than the prescribed definition from the literature which emphasizes a close one-on-one relationship. Those reporting a high number of protégés may be defining mentoring as a simple interaction between junior officers and midshipmen in which one or more mentor function may simply be exhibited, but not a true mentor-protégé relationship.

Despite the seemingly notable mean differences found by this study, the lack of statistical significance is a methodological problem that needs attention in future

research. The inability to replicate Allen's (2002) findings could be due to a number of factors related to this study. First, the small sample size of the junior officers participating in the study limited the potential for finding statistically significant relationships. Second, the use of chi-square analyses for comparing small subgroups may have reduced statistical significance due to the low power of this statistic. Lastly, the culture of the military may serve to diminish the value that officers give to prosocial personality traits. More specifically, the military is based on fundamental core values, is dependent on the chain-of-command, and is reliant on its member's ability to give and follow orders accordingly. On some level these traits certainly reduce the prosocial aspects of day-to-day military interaction.

Finally, since the data for this study were self-reported, common method bias may influence the results. Further research using more qualitative methods to elaborate some explanatory factors such as barriers and motivations could address this limitation.

E. RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

This study serves as an investigation into the propensity of Navy and Marine Corps junior officers stationed at the Naval Academy to mentor midshipmen. It follows three previous studies on mentorship at USNA. An exploratory survey-based study into third year midshipmen perceptions (Johnson, et al, 2001), a more in depth survey-based study of all four classes of midshipmen and their mentorship experiences (Baker, 2001), and a qualitative interview-based study of faculty mentors (Raithel, 2002). The following recommendations for future research are based on the results of the present study.

- Certainly a greater understanding into the significance of officer mentorship at the nations' military academies could be achieved if similar studies were conducted at the Air Force, Military, and Coast Guard Academies. The comparative data that would be available following these studies could be used to enhance the way we approach mentorship among our junior officers and maximize the development of our future military leaders.
- A future study of Naval Academy senior officers and their willingness to mentor both midshipmen and junior officers would serve to paint a more detailed picture

of mentorship and help to make mentorship a greater part of the leadership developmental process at USNA.

- Further research must be done into the specific dynamics of successful mentor and protégé interactions. Specifically, specific junior officer – midshipmen mentor dyads at the Naval Academy could be examined using a qualitative method. Such a study might uncover any differences of opinion that may exist over what characterizes successful mentoring.
- Another option for future research lies in the relationship between gender and junior officer mentors at USNA. While this study did not attempt to break out any trends in the gender of junior officer protégés, future research could be designed to determine if female junior officers predominantly mentor female midshipmen within the male dominated culture at USNA.
- More research should be done into the differences between Navy and Marine Corps junior officer decisions to mentor. This research would identify the degree to which mentorship is built into the Marine Corps culture and could help bridge the gap between the Navy and Marine Corps way of doing business when it comes to leadership.
- A similar study could be conducted that examines motivations and prosocial predispositions of a broader range of mentors at USNA. By analyzing senior officers and civilian faculty a clearer understanding of mentorship at the Naval Academy could be gained.
- A qualitative study could be conducted to identify existing barriers to mentoring at USNA and ways these barriers could be mitigated in order to maximize mentorship of USNA midshipmen.
- Qualitative research could enhance our understanding of the motivations for mentoring that may be different in a military context than in a civilian business context from which the variables cited in the literature review were derived.

- Additional research can be done that analyzes the EQ, or emotional intelligence, of junior officers at USNA. Junior officers with critical levels of EQ, or emotional intelligence, may be more skilled at managing their emotions and the emotions of others around them. This ability makes them more approachable in the eyes of midshipmen and increases the likelihood that they would be sought out as a prospective mentor.
- The literature review noted differences in which protégés are more likely to be selected – those with high potential or those with high need. Further research could be done on what criteria are being used by mentors at USNA in their choice of protégés. The type of mentoring and the preparation for mentoring would clearly be different for these two categories of protégés.
- Finally a need for further research on specific personality variables that seem to correlate with the efficacy of mentoring.

F. CONCLUSION

The current study sought to determine the extent to which junior officers stationed at the Naval Academy mentor midshipmen; As such it addressed several research questions. First, helping others and benefiting the organization appear to be the distinguishing sources of motivation for junior officers who choose to mentor. Secondly, the current study found that a junior officer's willingness to mentor and their levels of other-oriented empathy were associated with whether or not they chose to mentor. This study also tested the assumption that junior officers are willing to serve as mentors to midshipmen, and found that indeed a majority of junior officers serve as mentors, while even more say they are willing to mentor midshipmen. Lastly, this study was able to report that junior officers who were familiar with mentorship, and had previously been mentored in the fleet prior to being stationed at the Naval Academy chose to mentor midshipmen at a much higher rate than their peers who were never protégés to a mentor.

APPENDIX A: JUNIOR OFFICER MENTORSHIP SURVEY

From: LT Benjamin W. Oakes, USNA Company Officer LEAD Program

To: All Junior Officers stationed at USNA

Subj: Thesis Survey – Junior Officer Mentorship

Colleague,

Let me introduce myself. My name is Lieutenant Ben Oakes and I am currently a member of the eighth cohort of the USNA Company Officer Leadership Master's Program. I am a 1999 graduate of this institution and have spent my time in the fleet as a Surface Warfare Officer on the west coast. My decision to make the Navy a career and to come back to serve at the Naval Academy was strongly influenced by the superior mentors I had in the fleet. For my Master's thesis project, I have chosen to research the Junior Officer mentorship of midshipmen here on the yard.

Let me thank you for taking the time to participate in this confidential survey. It should only take you **15 minutes** to complete. All data will be collected by USNA's Department of Institutional Research in Halligan Hall and any personal identifying information will be stripped from your responses prior to use. Your participation is voluntary. However, due to the limited number of Junior Officers stationed here on the yard, it is vital to the success of my research that each of you participate. Your insights and your personal experience with mentoring are crucial to my research. Please complete this survey in a timely manner. I ask that each of you complete this survey **no later than** February 21st, 2005.

I have included below a definition of "mentorship" that I am using throughout my research:

"A mentor takes a personal interest in, guides, sponsors, or otherwise has a positive and significant influence on the professional career development of a junior person or protégé."

Again I would like to thank you for completing this survey and look forward to working with each and every one of you for the next two years here at the Naval Academy.

Very respectfully,

Benjamin W. Oakes
LT USN

****ALL RESPONDENTS SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

1. Have you been mentored while serving in the military? Yes/No

2. Have you mentored another person while in the military? Yes/No

SECTION 1: JUNIOR OFFICER MENTORS

***Part A.** Assuming you have been a mentor for USNA midshipman before, please respond to the following questions with regard to your willingness to mentor a midshipman again. If you have never been a mentor to a midshipman, please respond with regard to your intentions to be a mentor in the future. Use the scale below to mark your response by circling the corresponding number after each statement.*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. I have no desire to be a mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I would like to be a mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I intend to be a mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I would be comfortable assuming a mentoring role.	1	2	3	4	5

7. Have you served as a mentor for midshipmen at USNA? Yes/No

8. If yes, how many midshipmen have you mentored (include current protégés)? __

****NOTE: If you answered ‘NO’ to question 2. above, please skip to Section 2 on page 5**

Part B. Junior Officers may decide to mentor midshipmen for a variety of reasons. Please indicate the extent that each of the following factors motivated you or influenced your decision to become a mentor. Use the scale below to mark your response by circling the corresponding number after each statement..

	No Extent	Slight Extent	Some Extent	Large Extent	Strong Extent
9. To ensure that knowledge and information is passed on to others	1	2	3	4	5
10. A desire to build/develop a competent workforce within your organization	1	2	3	4	5
11. A general desire to help others	1	2	3	4	5
12. A desire to help others succeed in the organization	1	2	3	4	5
13. To benefit your organization	1	2	3	4	5
14. A desire to help minorities and/or women move through the organizational ranks	1	2	3	4	5
15. To have the protégé complete tasks that free up your time at work for other pursuits	1	2	3	4	5
16. A personal desire to build relationships by working with others	1	2	3	4	5
17. To increase your own personal learning	1	2	3	4	5
18. To enhance your reputation within the organization	1	2	3	4	5
19. To improve your own job performance	1	2	3	4	5
20. To rejuvenate yourself	1	2	3	4	5
21. To increase your support base within the organization	1	2	3	4	5
22. To gain a sense of self-satisfaction by passing on insights	1	2	3	4	5
23. The personal pride that mentoring someone brings	1	2	3	4	5
24. A desire to have an influence on others	1	2	3	4	5
25. To earn respect from others in the organization	1	2	3	4	5
26. The personal gratification that comes from seeing the protégé grow and develop	1	2	3	4	5
27. To enhance your visibility within the organization	1	2	3	4	5

****Complete Part C. ONLY if you have mentored a midshipman at USNA. If not, please skip to Section 2 on the next page.**

Part C. During your junior officer – midshipman mentoring relationship, indicate the extent that you engaged in the following behaviors. Use the scale below to mark your response by circling the corresponding number after each statement.

	No Extent	Slight Extent	Some Extent	Large Extent	Strong Extent
28. Reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of your protégé receiving a promotion	1	2	3	4	5
29. Helped your protégé finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete	1	2	3	4	5
30. Helped your protégé meet new colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
31. Gave your protégé assignments that increased written and personal contact with senior management	1	2	3	4	5
32. Assigned responsibilities to your protégé that increased the protégé's contact with people in the organization who could judge the protégé's potential for future advancement	1	2	3	4	5
33. Gave your protégé assignments or tasks that prepared him/her for promotion	1	2	3	4	5
34. Gave your protégé assignments that presented opportunities to learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5
35. Shared history of your own career with your protégé	1	2	3	4	5
36. Encouraged your protégé to prepare for advancement	1	2	3	4	5
37. Encouraged your protégé to try new ways of behaving in his/her job	1	2	3	4	5
38. Demonstrated good listening skills in conversations with your protégé	1	2	3	4	5
39. Discussed questions or concerns your protégé may have had regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors, or work/family conflicts	1	2	3	4	5
40. Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your protégé's problems	1	2	3	4	5
41. Encouraged your protégé to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from his/her work	1	2	3	4	5
42. Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings that your protégé discussed with you	1	2	3	4	5
43. Kept feelings and doubts your protégé shared with you in strict confidence	1	2	3	4	5
44. Conveyed feelings of respect for your protégé as an individual	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 2: WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

****Complete Part A. ONLY if you answered ‘YES’ to being mentored in the military at the beginning of this survey. If not, please skip to Part B.**

***Part A.** Assuming you have been mentored, please indicate the extent that your primary (most significant) mentor engaged in the following behaviors. Use the scale below to mark your response by circling the corresponding number after each statement.*

	No Extent	Slight Extent	Some Extent	Large Extent	Strong Extent
45. Reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of you receiving a promotion	1	2	3	4	5
46. Helped your protégé finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete	1	2	3	4	5
47. Helped you meet new colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
48. Gave you assignments that increased written and personal contact with senior management	1	2	3	4	5
49. Assigned responsibilities to you that increased your contact with people in the organization who could judge your potential for future advancement	1	2	3	4	5
50. Gave you assignments or tasks that prepared you for promotion	1	2	3	4	5
51. Gave you assignments that presented opportunities to learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5
52. Shared history of his/her own career with you	1	2	3	4	5
53. Encouraged you to prepare for advancement	1	2	3	4	5
54. Encouraged you to try new ways of behaving in your job	1	2	3	4	5
55. Demonstrated good listening skills in conversations with you	1	2	3	4	5
56. Discussed questions or concerns you may have had regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors, or work/family conflicts	1	2	3	4	5
57. Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems	1	2	3	4	5
58. Encouraged you to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from his/her work	1	2	3	4	5
59. Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings that you discussed with him/her	1	2	3	4	5
60. Kept feelings and doubts you shared with him/her in strict confidence	1	2	3	4	5
61. Conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual	1	2	3	4	5

****ALL RESPONDENTS SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

Part B. Below are a set of statements which may or may not describe how you make decisions when you have to choose between two courses of action or alternatives when there is no clear right way or wrong way to act. Some examples of such situations are: being asked to lend something to a close friend who often forgets to return things; deciding whether you should keep something you have won for yourself or share it with a friend; and choosing between staying late at work to finish a project and visiting a sick relative. After reading each statement, use the scale below to mark your response by circling the corresponding number after each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
62. My decisions are usually based on my concern for other people.	1	2	3	4	5
63. My decisions are usually based on what is the most fair and just way to act.	1	2	3	4	5
64. I choose alternatives that are intended to meet everybody's needs.	1	2	3	4	5
65. I choose a course of action that maximizes the help other people receive.	1	2	3	4	5
66. I choose a course of action that considers the rights of all people involved.	1	2	3	4	5
67. My decisions are usually based on concern for the welfare of others.	1	2	3	4	5

****ALL RESPONDENTS SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

Part C. Below are a number of statements which may or may not describe you, your feelings or your behavior. There are no right or wrong responses. Indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following items. Use the scale below to mark your response by circling the corresponding number after each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
68. I prefer to work with others in a work group than to work alone.	1	2	3	4	5
69. Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone rather than do a job where I must work with others in a work group.	1	2	3	4	5
70. I like it when members of a work group do things on their own, rather than working with others all the time.	1	2	3	4	5
71. If a good friend of mine wanted to injure someone, it would be my duty to try to stop them.	1	2	3	4	5
72. I wouldn't feel that I had to do my part in a group project if everyone else was lazy.	1	2	3	4	5
73. When people are nasty to me, I feel very little responsibility to treat them well.	1	2	3	4	5
74. I would feel less bothered about leaving litter in a dirty park than in a clean one.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
75. No matter what a person has done to us, there is no excuse for taking advantage of them.	1	2	3	4	5
76. Occasionally in life people find themselves in a situation in which they have absolutely no control over what they do to others.	1	2	3	4	5
77. With the pressure for grades and the wide-spread cheating in school nowadays, the individual who cheats occasionally is not really as much at fault.	1	2	3	4	5
78. It doesn't make much sense to be very concerned about how we act when we are sick and feeling miserable.	1	2	3	4	5
79. If I broke a machine through mishandling, I would feel less guilty if it was already damaged before I used it.	1	2	3	4	5
80. When you have a job to do, it is impossible to look out for everybody's best interest.	1	2	3	4	5
81. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.	1	2	3	4	5
82. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other person's" point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
83. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease.	1	2	3	4	5
84. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.	1	2	3	4	5
85. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.	1	2	3	4	5
86. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.	1	2	3	4	5
87. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.	1	2	3	4	5
88. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.	1	2	3	4	5
89. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies.	1	2	3	4	5
90. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.	1	2	3	4	5
91. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.	1	2	3	4	5
92. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
93. I tend to lose control during emergencies.	1	2	3	4	5
94. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while.	1	2	3	4	5
95. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.	1	2	3	4	5

****ALL RESPONDENTS SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

***Part D.** Below are several different actions in which people sometimes engage. Read each of them and decide how frequently you have carried it out in the past. Use the scale below to mark your response by circling the corresponding number after each statement.*

	Never	Once	More than Once	Often	Very Often
96. I have given money to a stranger who needed it (or asked me for it).	1	2	3	4	5
97. I have helped carry a stranger's belongings (e.g., books, parcels, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
98. I have allowed someone to go ahead of me in a line (e.g., supermarket, copying machine, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
99. I have let a neighbor whom I didn't know too well borrow an item of some value (e.g., tools, a dish, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
100. I have helped a coworker who I did not know that well with an assignment when my knowledge was greater than his or hers.	1	2	3	4	5
101. I have, before being asked, voluntarily looked after a neighbor's pets or children without being paid for it.	1	2	3	4	5
102. I have offered to help a handicapped or elderly stranger across a street.	1	2	3	4	5

****ALL RESPONDENTS SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

SECTION 3: DEMOGRAPHICS

Please fill in the following blanks or check/circle those answers that apply to you.

103. Rank: _____

104. Age: _____

105. Gender: _____

106. Race: _____

107. Service: ☐ Navy
☐ Marine Corps
☐ Other _____

108. Service Community/MOS: _____

109. Time in Service (Yrs & Mo.) _____

110. Time stationed at USNA (Yrs & Mo.) _____ of a _____ year/month tour.

111. Marital Status: ☐ Single
☐ Married
☐ Divorced

112. Do you have children? Yes/No

113. Career Intentions: ☐ Stay in 20+ years
☐ Get out at 20 years
☐ Stay in past initial obligation, but am undecided beyond that.
☐ Get out upon completion of my tour at USNA.
☐ Get out while I am still stationed here at USNA.

114. Education: ☐ Undergraduate Degree
☐ Working on Master's Degree/Law School
☐ Completed Master's Degree/Law School
☐ Working/Completed a second Master's degree
☐ Working/Completed a Doctorate degree

115. Did you receive your commission from USNA? Yes / No

116. Are you currently a: ☐ Coach? ☐ O-Rep?
☐ Faculty Advisor? ☐ Sponsor?
☐ Other? _____

117. Have you received training on how to be a mentor since reporting to USNA?
Yes/No

****ALL RESPONDENTS SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

SECTION 4: SHORT ANSWER

118. Has anything at USNA prevented or inhibited you from developing mentorship relationships with midshipmen? If so, please explain. _____

119. Does USNA reward mentoring midshipmen? If so, how? If not, why do you feel that is? _____

120. Please offer any personal reflections or observations about junior officers serving as mentors or about mentoring as a whole at USNA? _____

APPENDIX B: MENTORSHIP SURVEY SHORT ANSWER SUMMARIES

1. Has anything at USNA prevented or inhibited you from developing mentorship relationships with midshipmen? If yes, please explain:

Workload
Working at USNA, it is very easy to get overinvolved. I just do not have time to give for a mentorship program and would not want to do an injustice to the midshipman.
too much to do at work to adequately assume more mentorees. would feel like i would be cheating them out of more assistance.
Too much email tasking & paperwork. I spend far too much time at the desk completing required tasks. Company Officers should have much more free time to do leadership-type things, such as speak with their people, inspect room, monitor sporting events, intramurals, etc. I'm usually too busy to comfortably do these things and spend some time with my family.
Time. To be an effective mentor you have to have the time to invest in that person. Company Officers tend to get tasked with too much bullshit to be effective mentors to more midshipmen.
TIME.
Time, see below.
Time constraints.
Time constraints
Time available in daily schedule
Time as a resource is thin (but will probably always be that way).
The sheer scope and time required of my daily routine prevents me from spending as much quality peopole time as I'd wish.
The position of Company Officer. Midshipmen naturally shy away from their Company Officer when it comes to a mentorship role. The only people I realistically have a chance to mentor are my Company Commander and XO. As an O-Rep, it's much easier to mentor the Midshipmen on my team.
The Midshipmen are kept too busy for the faculty to have too much impact other than in the classroom.
The last request for volunteers to mentor midshipmen stipulated that the mentors needed to be LCDR or above. LT's were not allowed to be mentors.
The exact opposite is true. Since I see a lack of real Officer mentorship towards the Midshipmen I have gone out of myway to interact and mentor as many Mids as possible. We are supposed to be leaders, guides, and mentors but to many Officers stationed here are more concerned about taking care of themselves. This in my mind is a reflection on the type of Officer they are and probably indicative of the relationship thay had with the enlisted who servered with them!
The amount of time/collateral duties involved with being a company officer. You have a limited span of influence because one can only develop so many mentor-type relationships - and give it the attention it requires - considering the number of Mids we lead and teach.
Staff jobs offer little contact time with midshipmen, even as an O-rep or teacher, compared to a full time teacher or Company Officer.
Since I have been assigned here less than year my interaction with mids has been pretty limited so far. (holidays and maternity leave)
Primary job responsibilities have inhibited me from having positive interaction with midshipmen.
Only so much time in the day // Mids are even more busy than I.

Ocaissionally my own willingness to engage and/or artificial barriers presented by being a Company Officer.
Not enough time....
My job prevents time and interaction with Midshipmen.
My job on the Superintendent's staff is very time-consuming, it would be hard to break aware and provide mentorship. Most of my interaction with MIDN comes at functions at the Buchanan House.
My job keeps be busy and while I have interactions with midshipmen, they are business oriented.
My job is not condusive towards mentorship
Lack of time for the midshipmen
Just got here.
I'm a "mentor" for every one of the 142 midshipmen in the company--I don't play favorites and am strongly opposed to any mentor program for a company officer or for midshipmen.
I feel that being a positive role model in the classroom (i.e. talking about the positives of a career in the Navy, etc.) is a form of mentorship even though it's not the typical one-on-one stuff. I try to take a personal interest in each student, but it's hard unless they seek EI outside of the classroom setting.
Generally, workload.
Family obligations (health).
Daily job assignments/administrative duties
Current assignment doesn't have me coming in contact with midshipmen on a regular basis.
Checked in last month and have not had the opportunity yet
By design, the Company Officer role is easily viewed as "the enforcer" role at USNA. That in of itself detracts from the essence of a mentorship program.
Being assigned to the Special Events Staff where I have very little contact with Midshipmen. I was given orders to go to SeaNav where I would have had a lot of interaction with mids.

2. Does USNA reward mentoring midshipmen? Explain your answer:

A person should expect to get only personal satisfaction from mentoring midshipmen. That's why we're Naval Officers. Do we expect anything in return to do our jobs?
Although they are our primary focus and mentoring takes a lot of time, my superiors do not always recognize the amount of time that it takes away from my other duties.
Any answer I puit will be percieved as I am disgruntled and self serving so I will pass!
As a Compnay Officer, it is our job to mentor midshipmen. If we do it, then we are doing our job.
Company Officers advance; teachers get an easy life in the Luce Hall separation factory while getting ready to get out.
Conflicts with the day to day monitored operations.
Heads of Ethics / Leadership programs are very appreciative of volunteers
I am guessing, but I assume most of it goes on unrecognized.
I am not sure if USNA rewards mentorship.
I am too new to have enough data to answer this question.
I didn't want to answer Yes or No because I don't know if USNA rewards mentoring MIDN.
I don't believe that the organization really "rewards" mentors in a tangible way, but the experience itself is rewarding.
I don't know. I don't really know what the "Mentoring" program is. I assumed that teaching a group of prospective Marine Officers in a Practicum class is a type of mentoring and have based my answers on that.

I don't really know of a way the institution "rewards" a junior officer for mentoring a midshipmen, and I don't think it needs to. Just because of the nature of a JO, we should want and strive to mentor every midshipmen we can. Call it our duty or whatever you want, it's just the right thing to do.
I don't think that we are recognized if we go the extra mile and really spend significant time with MIDN, a difficulty because of time constraints and collateral duties. However, neither do I expect recognition. The travesty, is that the system is set up so that the extra time is truly a daunting task. And the time SHOULD be available to the mids as a priority over collateral duties.
I have heard the program talked about, but more for senior officers. Midshipmen should start with the basics of what it's like to be a junior officer and how to handle the demands of becoming warfare qualified and being a division officer before moving on to the more theoretical aspects of leadership.
I have mentored many Midshipman, not expectating any personal gain, nor believing any rewards should be given for mentorship. Mentorship should be something you do because you believe in it and you truly care about the Mids, not because you are looking for recognition or a reward.
I have no experience with this.
I have not experienced any external reward for mentoring
I have not heard of any rewards. I am working with three different Mids (two academic, one conduct).
I have seen no evidence in 18 months at the USNA of any special consideration given to officers who mentor.
I haven't been exposed to it.
I haven't even been told that I should be mentoring, I occasionally take it upon myself to better this place, but there is no push for it.
I haven't noticed anything, but there is a reward just working with them in the classroom, at practice and being a sponsor.
I hope that lots of mentoring is going on, but I don't see any rewards, exactly.
I think it does to the extent that it values mentoring and--when aware of mentoring taking place--senior leaders thank mentors for their time and stress the importance of the impact the mentor is having. But if by "reward" one means advancement, promotion, assignments, etc., I would say "no," not necessarily.
I think that the "reward" for mentoring someone is a sense of pride/satisfaction that you are helping someone else. Company Officers are expected to mentor their midshipmen among other things. So company officers who are ranked highly on their fitness reports are probably the ones who are good mentors. I guess a high fitness report could be considered a "reward."
I think that the rewards for mentoring are in seeing the results of the mentoring . . . that I know of, there is no "reward system" for mentors.
I would love to be a mentor, but other than trying to get involved with mids in class and through ECA's, I have never heard of a formal mentoring program.
I would say that that there is no specific reward given to a person who is serving as a mentor. The person's reward could be personal...a feeling of satisfaction knowing that they are giving a junior person advice or help.
I'm not sure I know of a program to specifically mentor Mids. I know I offer my assistance and some Mids take me up on experience and assistance I can provide to them, but there is no formal mentoring process that I have seen.
I'm sure they do, I've just never seen the reward.
It is certainly looked at positively (and as part of the job description)to mentor MIDS. While it may be inconvenient at some time due to other duties, it is encouraged.
It is expected of you in your normal day to day duties to be a mentor, especially as a company officer.
It is looked upon favorably.
It is not officially recognized.

It is not really rewarded or punished - you don't do it for the fitrep - you do it to give back to the midshipmen.
It's considered to be a part of your job (at least as a company officer).
JUST IN SEEING MIDS DO WELL.
Mentoring is occasionally, but not systematically a factor on FITREPS. This is not a USNA-specific function. Otherwise, there are no tangible benefits (e.g., extra pay, extra time off, early promotion, etc.) associated with performing this function. This is entirely reasonable, since, first of all, it is a duty and its rewards are intrinsic to the relationship, and second, a reward system would corrupt mentoring relationships by injecting ulterior motives and demanding that a natural, organic thing (human relationship) become formal and uniform.
Mentoring should be done for personal satisfaction. I think if a person is mentoring for some kind of benefit then they are meeting a check in the box, not truly mentoring. It is looked upon unfavorably in my community (subs) if you don't but I don't see that there is any reward for being a proactive mentor
Mentoring, in the programmatical sense, is irrelevant here
Mentorship is just another voluntary collateral duty taken on after primary assignment and any mandatory collateral duties. With a family to raise and deployments looming in the next assignment after USNA there just isn't always enough time to take on a mentorship and do it right. Additionally as a tripple outsider (Marine, Non-graduate, and a lawyer) I have not felt overly encouraged to mentor midshipmen or in general felt very welcomed at the USNA. I initially anticipated coming here to teach and having more time to mentor midshipmen. My staff assignment has not given me as much time to interact with midshipmen in general. For a "shore tour" I have spent as much time away from family as a non-deployed "fleet tour" with high op-tempo. I am actually looking at orders to Iraq as a break from the USNA in a more friendly environment.
My answer would actually be closer to "unsure." Mainly because I have never heard of any "reward" program but also don't necessarily understand the context of the word "reward" as used here.
No institutional recognition for mentoring - not that there needs to be either.
No metric established to measure amount of mentoring. USNA is rewarded by doing it, but they don't hand out rewards....nor should they.
My experience is that mentoring occurs informally and flies under the USNA radar. USNA knows it happens but doesn't know where or when. From a military faculty perspective USNA views mentoring as a subset of contact hours that include the given subject material, EI, and ethics. USNA cannot reward what it does not 'see'. Frankly, it is the good intentions and professionalism of individuals acting appropriately when no one is watching that makes mentoring work at the Academy.
No recognition, no "check in the box," no notice, no incentive. HOWEVER, I do strongly believe that good mentoring is its own reward, so I don't think USNA SHOULD reward mentoring; it should be expected!
No reward needed. The reward is seeing them improve.
No rewards offered for mentoring mids.
No we don't. And we shouldn't.
No, the Academy doesn't... but it shouldn't. The Midshipmen being mentored will ideally enter the fleet as a better officer - this serves everyone's best interests.
No. The only thing USNA rewards is the number of collateral duties you have. The reward for mentoring Midshipmen is strictly on a personal level (for you and the Midshipman).
Only rewards I have seen is fit-rep bullets.
Overtasked. Emphasis is given to the midshipmen in voice only.
Perhaps in the hall, but not, as far as I can tell, on the academic side.
reward in the sense you can help them make their career decisions, not in a physical sense. On some levels I feel it is expected you will serve as a mentor to the mids.

Reward is personal
Said Yes, but I haven't been here long enough.
That's not the point. Mentoring is rewarding in itself.
The academy doesn't reward any voluntary - or mandatory for that matter - extra-curricular activity that officers do. I'm a number to be tasked here.
The institution rarely gives out awards to individuals; the individual, however, is rewarded through the things he or she learns from the mentor.
The reward is in the abundance of their product. The rewards is to watch someone grow.
The reward is in the support that USNA gives to mentors.
The reward is personal. I am not aware of any reward USNA specifically offers.
The rewards come from the individuals being mentored. Seeing them grow and mature is reward enough.
There are several faculty teaching awards that (Apgar, Clements, etc) that look at mentoring
There is no institutional "reward" but then there shouldn't be - it's part of the job and a responsibility. The reward is in the mentoring process.
There is no mechanism in place - outside of fitrep bullets - to do this. This is OK, because mentoring is an inherent duty, and we should not be rewarded for doing our duty.
There is no need for reward. If the protege succeeds, that's reward enough.
There is no real visibility on it. But, there shouldn't be. I don't expect USNA to change in this aspect.
There is no reward for mentoring. It is a volutary issue, which should produce personal satisfaction.
There isn't a "reward system" in place for those who mentor midshipmen. You take it out of your own time and do it because it's the right thing to do. Some officers don't mentor midshipmen and that's not looked upon as either a negative or positive. The benefit for mentoring comes from seeing my mids do the right thing for themselves and make well educated decisions about their future.
Those who spend significant time mentoring Midshipmen are generally known and that weighs into Fitreps somewhat. At the end of the day, our job is to mentor the Mids.
Unsure if mentoring is reconized beyong the "atta boy" received from immediate superiors.
USNA and the Navy rewards substantive achievements- things that can be measured and counted. Mentoring is difficult to grade and the impact is often not seen or felt for years.
USNA doesn't give shit about what you do right--it's more about what you do wrong.
USNA doesn't specifically reward mentors, the adminstration just hopes or assumes that the people assigned here will take it upon themselves to mentor mids.
USNA doesn't specifically reward the mentoring I've done; however, the fact that I can consider it part of my job is reward enough.
USNA seems to place more emphasis on paperwork, and creating or changing instructions. There are so many instructions created and distributed here that it's very difficult to read and fully understand all of them. USNA seems to focus rewards (verbal and written) more on tangible things, such as having the entire complete taskers on early/on time, fewest unauthorized absences from events (class, musters, etc), company academic performance, Plebe Pro-quiz performance, etc. Very few senior leaders (if any) ever discuss/address the amount of time that a company officer spends mentoring midshipmen. Mentoring takes a significant amount of time - time that could otherwise be used to complete taskers and depart for home early. In other words, if company officers want to depart for the day at a normal hour, they will usually have to deny the midshipmen quality mentorship time.
You get the satisfaction of knowing that you passed on information to a future Navy/Marine Corps Officer that may help him/her later in their career.

3. Please offer any personal reflections or observations about junior officers serving as mentors or about mentoring as a whole at USNA.

When sought out to mentor by a midshipman I have always responded positively. I have not actively solicited to be a mentor for the reasons stated above. Mentorship is something that requires a very unique dynamic that can not be forced or imposed. I believe the services as a whole need a culture shift to encourage more mentorship. I have never had a mentor and at time wish I had when faced with various career decision. I try to be helpful to all company grade officers and enlisted in terms of advise or guidance when solicited. I would gladly enter into a mentoring relationship with any Marine who sought me out to do so.
We would probably mentor midshipmen much more if we were mentored ourselves more.
Warrior Coach is a great program. I wish that I had more time to take on more mentorees. I like the fact that the structure is not rigid and that we can tailor the program to our skills and the needs of the individual.
Too many JO's fall into the disciplinarian role and therefore ostracize themselves from being effective mentors. It is very possible to serve as an effective mentor while still enforcing the standards. Too many JO's try either to be the good guy or the bad guy and not the mentor.
There are efforts to mentor the midn- some midn respond, others have better things to do with their time. Wrt mentoring on the staff side, there is none. Staff are too busy to take care of their own.
Opportunities are plentiful. I've developed a mentor relationship with almost every mid I've taught, advised, trained, etc. Many still come to my office 3 semesters later.
More consideration needs to be given to human error rather than strict rule compliance. Midshipmen are capable of learning from their mistakes, a hard line does not always need to be taken. Give them some room to make their own decisions.
JOs need better Senior mentors.
In my opinion, lieutenants are looked down upon by the more senior leadership (the three dozen O-6s on the Yard) as not having had enough experiences to properly mentor midshipmen, when this is far from the case. Most lieutenants have a better understanding on how to maintain a proper senior-subordinate professional/personal relationship with midshipmen than many senior officers.
If you do it right it takes alot of time and a big commitement. The Mids appreciate it (my relationship with them attests to that) but the Administration eithers doesn't know what you do or care what you do. I myself thought on numerous occassions why bother and have said "when in Rome be like the Romans". I might as well just take care of myself and do as little as so and so for they will leave here with the same fitness report and award as I have. Thankfully I always realize that a true leader is not neccesarily the best or most recognized leader, but its the leader who gets the best out of those they lead and who is most appreciated by those they lead.
I think that it is imperative that we do everything in our power to connect with and mentor midshipmen. They are the reason that we are here...Not to get a master's, not to get a good FITREP, but strictly to help the mids. I've seen others, even Company Officers who do not understand this and will not go out of their way to help mids. I think that is ridiculous.
I have seen many officers here on the yard who care more about themselves and their career than they do about the Mids who they have been sent here to mentor and teach. Those are the officers who wish there were rewards or recognition for mentorship. I have also seen and still see today many officers who are awesome mentors and who the Mids respect and want to be like. There were officers like that when I was here and who I try to model myself after. A lot of Mids approach me with problems they're having with other officers and ask for advice on what they should do, all I can tell them is that there are people and leadership characteristics here at school that they'll like and want to replicate as leaders and there are those that we can describe as horrible leadership examples . . . and those are the officers that they can use as examples of what not to be like.

I can think of two military mentors and one civilian mentor I've had, that is, people who I know took time to educate and help me. All are twenty years older than me. The principle connection I see there is the presence of a generational gap: my mentors have had children my age, or nearly so, and so have profoundly more observational experience with all aspects of someone my age. Certainly a 29-year-old in intimate contact with 22 year-olds can have a good deal of impact, however, the hierarchical organization of the military encourages these opportunities to mentor, but not opportunities to be a protegee.
I am on the faculty and have been mentored by both civilian and military on teaching. To this point, I have not been mentored by a senior military officer, and I have a feeling I will go my entire tour here without one. I do anticipate becoming more active with the Brigade at a later date.
From my dealings with mentors they have been successful.
Because company officers are still seen as "them" it is more difficult for us to develop that kind of relationship with mids than for folks outside the hall.
All of the midshipmen that I've mentored since I've been here have been because we have been able to interact well as individuals. I think having an assigned mentor would not be as effective. Some midshipmen don't want mentorship - they just want to go through the Academy and graduate. They could care less about becoming better developed officers. The midshipmen that are interested in mentorship I spend a significant amount of my time with because that's how I feel I can make a lasting impact on my people - which is the whole reason I came to the Academy as a Company Officer in the first place.
When sought out to mentor by a midshipman I have always responded positively. I have not actively solicited to be a mentor for the reasons stated above. Mentorship is something that requires a very unique dynamic that can not be forced or imposed. I believe the services as a whole need a culture shift to encourage more mentorship. I have never had a mentor and at time wish I had when faced with various career decision. I try to be helpful to all company grade officers and enlisted in terms of advise or guidance when solicited. I would gladly enter into a mentoring relationship with any Marine who sought me out to do so.
We would probably mentor midshipmen much more if we were mentored ourselves more.
Warrior Coach is a great program. I wish that I had more time to take on more mentorees. I like the fact that the structure is not rigid and that we can tailor the program to our skills and the needs of the individual.
Too many JO's fall into the disciplinarian role and therefore ostracize themselves from being effective mentors. It is very possible to serve as an effective mentor while still enforcing the standards. Too many JO's try either to be the good guy or the bad guy and not the mentor.
There are efforts to mentor the midn- some midn respond, others have better things to do with their time. Wrt mentoring on the staff side, there is none. Staff are too busy to take care of their own.
Opportunities are plentiful. I've developed a mentor relationship with almost every mid I've taught, advised, trained, etc. Many still come to my office 3 semesters later.
More consideration needs to be given to human error rather than strict rule compliance. Midshipmen are capable of learning from their mistakes, a hard line does not always need to be taken. Give them some room to make their own decisions.
JOs need better Senior mentors.
In my opinion, lieutenants are looked down upon by the more senior leadership (the three dozen O-6s on the Yard) as not having had enough experiences to properly mentor midshipmen, when this is far from the case. Most lieutenants have a better understanding on how to maintain a proper senior-subordinate professional/personal relationship with midshipmen than many senior officers.
If you do it right it takes alot of time and a big commitement. The Mids appreciate it (my relationship with them attests to that) but the Administration eithers doesn't know what you do or care what you do. I myself thought on numerous occassions why bother and have said "when in Rome be like the Romans". I might as well just take care of myself and do as little as so and so for they will leave here with the same fitness report and award as I have. Thankfully

I always realize that a true leader is not necessarily the best or most recognized leader, but its the leader who gets the best out of those they lead and who is most appreciated by those they lead.
I think that it is imperative that we do everything in our power to connect with and mentor midshipmen. They are the reason that we are here...Not to get a master's, not to get a good FITREP, but strictly to help the mids. I've seen others, even Company Officers who do not understand this and will not go out of their way to help mids. I think that is ridiculous.
I have seen many officers here on the yard who care more about themselves and their career than they do about the Mids who they have been sent here to mentor and teach. Those are the officers who wish there were rewards or recognition for mentorship. I have also seen and still see today many officers who are awesome mentors and who the Mids respect and want to be like. There were officers like that when I was here and who I try to model myself after. A lot of Mids approach me with problems they're having with other officers and ask for advice on what they should do, all I can tell them is that there are people and leadership characteristics here at school that they'll like and want to replicate as leaders and there are those that we can describe as horrible leadership examples . . . and those are the officers that they can use as examples of what not to be like.
I can think of two military mentors and one civilian mentor I've had, that is, people who I know took time to educate and help me. All are twenty years older than me. The principle connection I see there is the presence of a generational gap: my mentors have had children my age, or nearly so, and so have profoundly more observational experience with all aspects of someone my age. Certainly a 29-year-old in intimate contact with 22 year-olds can have a good deal of impact, however, the hierarchical organization of the military encourages these opportunities to mentor, but not opportunities to be a protege.
I am on the faculty and have been mentored by both civilian and military on teaching. To this point, I have not been mentored by a senior military officer, and I have a feeling I will go my entire tour here without one. I do anticipate becoming more active with the Brigade at a later date.
From my dealings with mentors they have been succesful.
Because company officers are still seen as "them" it is more difficult for us to develop that kind of relationship with mids than for folks outside the hall.
All of the midshipmen that I've mentored since I've been here have been because we have been able to interact well as individuals. I think having an assigned mentor would not be as effective. Some midshipmen don't want mentorship - they just want to go through the Academy and graduate. They could care less about becoming better developed officers. The midshipmen that are interested in mentorship I spend a significant amount of my time with because that's how I feel I can make a lasting impact on my people - which is the whole reason I came to the Academy as a Company Officer in the first place.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allen, T.D. (2002). Mentoring others: A dispositional and motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62, 134-154.
- Allen, T.D., & Eby, L.T. (2003). Relationship Effectiveness for Mentors: Factors Associated with Learning and Quality. *Journal of Management*, 29, 469-486.
- Allen, T.D. & Poteet, M.L. (1999). Developing effective mentoring relationships: Strategies from the mentor's viewpoint. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 48, 59-73.
- Allen, T.D., Poteet, M.L., & Burroughs, S.M. (1997). The Mentor's Perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 70-89.
- Allen, T.D., Poteet, M.L., & Russell, E.A. (2000). Protégé Selection by Mentors: What Makes the Difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 271-282.
- Baker, B.T. (2001). Mentoring experiences among Midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy. MS Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy, Monterey, California.
- Baker, B.T., Hocevar, S.P., & Johnson, W.B. (2003). The Prevalence and Nature of Service Academy Mentoring: A study of Navy Midshipmen. *Military Psychology*, 15(4), 273-283.
- Buhler, P.A. (1998). A New Role for Managers: The Move From Directing to Coaching; Managing in the 90's. *Supervision*, Vol. 59, No. 10, pp. 16.
- Cesa, I.L., & Fraser, S.C. (1989). A Method for Encouraging the Development of Good Mentor-Protégé Relationships. *Teaching of Psychology*, 16, 125-128.
- Chao, G.T. (1997). Mentoring Phases and Outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 15-28.
- Chao, G.T., & Walz, P.M. (1992). "Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison of Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Nonmentored Counterparts." *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 45, pp. 619-636.
- Dreher, G.F., & Ash, R.A. (1990). A Comparative Study of Mentoring among Men and Women in Managerial, Professional, and Technical Positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp. 297-308.

- Dreher, G.F., & Cox, T.H. (1996). Race, Gender, and Opportunity: A Study of Compensation Attainment and the Establishment of Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 297-308.
- Ensher, E.A. & Murphy, S.E. (1997). Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 460-481.
- Fagenson, E.A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégé versus non-protéges. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, pp. 309-320.
- Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and Undergraduate Academic Success: A Literature Review. *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 505-532.
- Johnson, W.B. & Huwe, J.M. (2002). Toward a typology of mentorship dysfunction in graduate school. *Psychotherapy*, 39, 44-55.
- Johnson, W.B., Huwe, J.M., Fallow, A., Lall, R., Holmes, E.K., & Hall, W. (1999, December). The flag officer mentor study: Did Admirals have mentors? *Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute*, 44-46.
- Johnson, W.B., Lall, R., Holmes, E.K., Huwe, J.M., & Norlund, M.D. (2001). Mentoring experiences among Navy midshipmen. *Military Medicine*, 166, 27-31.
- Ham, W.T. (2001, July). CNO Says Diversity is Winning “War For People” in Every Community. Navy Wire Service (NWS). NWS24jul-2.
- Kram, K.E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 4, pp. 608-625.
- Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33, 3, pp. 161-173.
- Noe, R.A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 457-479.
- Penner, L.A., Craiger, J.P., Fritzsche, B.A., & Friefield, T.R. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (vol. 10, pp. 147-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ragins, B.R., & Cotton, J.L. (1993). Gender and Willingness to Mentor in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 19, 97-111.

- Ragins, B.R., & Cotton, J.L. (1999). Mentor Functions and Outcomes: A comparison of Men and Women in Formal and Informal Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 529-549.
- Ragins, B.R., & Scandura, T.A. (1994). Gender differences in expected outcomes of mentoring relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 957-971.
- Roche, G.R. (1979). Much Ado about Mentors. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan/Feb 1979, 14.
- Scandura, T.A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 169-174.
- Scandura, T.A. (1998). Dysfunctional Mentoring Relationships and Outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 24, 449-467.
- Schoultz, R., CAPT. USN (2004). *Warrior Spirit Coaching Module*. Character Development Department, United States Naval Academy.
- Steinberg, A.G., & Foley, D.M. (1999). Mentoring in the Army: From Buzzword to Practice. *Military Psychology*, 11(4), 365-379.
- Thomas, D.A. (1990). "The Impact of Race on Managers' Experiences of Developmental Relationships (Mentoring and Sponsorship): An Intra-Organizational Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 479-492.
- United States Naval Academy. (2004). *Reef Points*. Annapolis, MD.
- U.S. Navy (1997). *Surface Warfare Junior Officer Survey*.
- Whitely, W., Dougerty, T.W., & Dreher, G.F. (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 331-351.
- Wilson, J.A., & Elman, N.S. (1990). Organizational Benefits of Mentoring. *Academy of Management Executive*, 4, 88-94.
- Wright, C.A., & Wright, S.D. (1987). The Role of Mentors in the Career Development of Young Professionals. *Family Relations*, 36, 204-208.
- Zey, M.G. (1985). Mentor Programs: Making the right moves. *Personnel Journal*, 64, 53-57.
- Zey, M.G. (1988). A mentor for all reasons. *Personnel Journal*, 67, 46-51.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, VA
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA
3. Nimitz Library
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, MD
4. United States Naval Academy
Office of Institutional Research
Annapolis, MD
5. Colonel John Rupp, USMC
Deputy Director, Center for the Study of Professional Military Ethics
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, MD
6. Dr. Brad Johnson
Department of Leadership, Ethics & Law
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, MD
7. Susan Hocevar
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA
8. LT Benjamin W. Oakes
Annapolis, MD